National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment---Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS

VOL. XII. NO. 46. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1852. WHOLE NO. 618.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & Johnston, printers.

Selections.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE Upper Canada Anti-Slavery Society.

We copied, last week, from the *Toronto Globe*, the Resolutions passed at the First Annual Meeting of the Upper Canada Anti-Slavery Society, held at Toronto, on the 24th ult. A later number of the same paper contains a fuller report of the meeting, a portion of which we transfer to our columns.

After the preliminary proceedings of opening the meeting, and a brief address from Dr. Willis, the President, the Annual Report was read by Mr. Thomas Hensing, the Secretary. The *Globe*, remarking that it commences with an account of the circumstances in which the Society originated, and contained some interesting extracts from the correspondence of several persons abroad, thus proceeds:

Reference is then made to the visit of George Thompson, Esq., and the grand influence it exercised in breaking down opposition, moving the indifferent, and warming anew the men of flagging zeal. The question what have we to do with Slavey, was discussed fully and unanswerably. Testimony was borne to the success of the Ladies' Association, by whom more than a hundred families have been relieved during the past year.

Upon the Emigration and Colonisation of Free Coloured people, the Report is full—neither are encouraged — the Colonisation scheme utterly condemned. On this point, the Committee conclude thus:

"While we would not oppose voluntary emigration to Africa or any other country, we cannot advise such a step. We have greater faith in the growing intelligence of the age, in the spread of knowledge, in the power of truth, and the principles of the Gospel. The forcible expulsion of 500,000 peaceable citizens cannot be perpetrated in the Nineteenth Century, especially in the case of men who are making astonishing progress towards influence, wealth and education—men who are furnishing pulpits with learned and eloquent divines—the bar with able advocates, and the press with able writers. Let the Free people of Colour, therefore, be firm, act uprightly, industriously, and manfully, and they will command the respect of the world. Above all, let them and their friends eschew the 'philosophy of despair,' and remember that truth must prevail—that Slavery must come to an end; and that amidst much that is dark and discouraging, there are still hopeful signs that the final day is drawing near."

A full account is given of the different Coloured settlements in Canada — their present position — members—prospects—and what is being done for their moral and physical welfare—agriculture is encouraged.

"Let the people of Colour, therefore, take the advice of their best friends, cease to congregate in towns, and satisfy themselves with being hewers of wood and drawers of water, for others. Let them seek the country as soon as they possess the means, and become tillers of the soil—their own soil, if possible. With the soil let them also cultivate their minds—for they possess minds, capable of high cultivation, and we shall soon cease to hear of the stupidity and rascality of blacks. We would earnestly press this matter upon the Committee appointed, as one to which they should give their earliest and most sedulous attention."

An abstract of Anti-Slavery action throughout the world follows—and the favourable appearances in Britain, France, Denmark, Sweden, Tunis, and even Brazil, contrasted with those discouraging features which the cause presents in the United States. The conclusion of the whole runs thus:

"To one contemplating these triumphs of truth and justice in the nations of the Old World, how anomalous the retrogressive tendency exhibited in democratic America! In 1852, we find the United States aiming to extend the area of Slavery and to render it perpetual—though it is the cause of disorganization and disunion, though it occasions murder and bloodshed, destroys family purity, hinders civilization and refinement, and is daily winding itself more closely around every civil and social institution. It is the deadly Upas tree, under which

> 'All life dies, death lives, and nature breeds
> Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things;
> Abominable, unutterable, and worse
> Than fables yet have feigned, or fear conceived.'

Church and State are at this moment vieing in their efforts to rivet tighter the chains on the poor victims at the South, and to reclaim every unhappy fugitive from Southern bondage. To say nothing of the Calhouns and Clays, and Footes and Websters—the politicians of the day—how lamentable it is to witness the religious leaders of the people, of almost all denominations, apologizing (to say the least) for what reason, conscience, and Revelation condemn. 'It is more than the ethics of the Bible will allow,' says a Presbyterian, 'to talk about a 'higher law' with an oath to support the Constitution on the lips.' 'Immediate emancipation would be more sinful than Slavery itself. To be loyal to the confederacy is piety, for it is fidelity towards God,' exclaims the Episcopalian. 'It is our duty,' continues the Unitarian, 'to return the fugitive.' 'The Jewish polity instituted by God himself, the injunctions of the New Testament, and the Moral Law, testify that Slavery *is not immoral*. It was founded *in right*," so teaches a Professor in a Methodist College. 'If by one prayer I could liberate every slave in the world, I would not dare to offer it,' concludes the Rev. Dr. Spring. And, yet, dark though this picture is, light is breaking forth. There is a leaven, leavening the mass—a force slowly but surely working within, which will, ere long, sweep away every vestige of a system so ruinous to men and so offensive to God. This light began to dawn and this leaven to work in 1832, when the New England Anti-Slavery Society was formed, and still more powerfully in the following year, when those fifty-six patriotic men met in Philadelphia organized the National Anti-Slavery Society, and promulgated that 'Declaration of Sentiments,' which has since continued to be advocated so nobly, so fearlessly. Politicians are admitting this light, and one here and there is espousing the cause of freedom. Clergymen even venture to speak out on the side of human rights: and gloomy though the horizon is, and lowering the heavens, the Anti-Slavery cause is advancing to a glorious consummation.

"We might tell of 'recreant politicians who are meeting the frowns of betrayed and indignant constituents,' of unscrupulous government officials foiled in their attempts to hang their countrymen for 'obeying God rather than men,' but with greater pleasure do we record the sentiments of a Storrs, who has the courage to elevate the commandments of God above the laws of the United States: of a Colver who dares to affirm that the 'inherent and manifest iniquity of the Fugitive Slave Bill and its hostility to the law of God, render disobedience to its demands a solemn duty.' 'When we have ceased to pray,' says Beecher, 'when we have rooted out the humanities which, since our connection with the Gospel, have been growing within us; when we have resumed our Bibles and renounced off God, then will we join with those whose patriotism exhibits itself in disrobing men of every natural right, and driving them from light and religion into gross heathenism.' 'I would sooner die than be its agent,' adds a Spear, 'The higher law of Eternal Right would be in my way; and by its decision I must abide.' Let, then, the Christian Abolitionists of the United States and elsewhere, in the emphatic language of the aged Clarkson, 'persevere,' especially let the Church be faithful to her great Head; let such sentiments as the above be proclaimed from every pulpit, and Slavery shall disappear, for, to use the memorable words of the distinguished Barnes, 'there is no power out of the church that could sustain Slavery an hour if it were not sustained in it. In concluding our survey of the Anti-Slavery cause, we are induced to believe that, during the past year, real progress has been made. The abominations of Slavery have been brought into bolder relief, and the indignation of the just and virtuous has been more deeply and more loudly expressed, and a master mind has lately told us that 'nothing is able to stand against the power of moral influence—the influence of public opinion.' Let the friends of humanity persevere in their energetic effects on behalf of the coloured man, loosed and free, and, invoking His blessing on their enterprise, let them rely with unshaken confidence, for ultimate success, on the God of the oppressed.

> "'Oh, speed the moment
> When wrong shall cease—and Liberty and Love
> And Truth and Right, throughout the earth be known
> As in their home above.'"

Dr. BURNS, in moving the first resolution, took occasion to congratulate the members of the Society, on the progress it had made in both parts of its scheme, the elevation of public sentiment on the great question of Liberty and Slavery, and the relief of the refugees from the United States. On this last point he took special notice of the great exertions of the Ladies' Committee, their self-denying visits to the refugees—their minute and judicious investigation of each case—and their liberal and considerate distributions to the distressed. He adverted to the terms of the resolution, as fairly descriptive of the tendency of the Slave system, socially and morally.

It is based on injustice, and is in fact the dominion of mere brute power over right; that which is thus morally wrong cannot be politically right. It is opposed to God's law, and to the law of love, as peculiarly the law of the New Testament. It interposes most fatal obstacles in the way of the instruction of the Coloured man, in that knowledge which is every man's birthright. It encourages vices of the basest kind, and is at war with the elements of human progress. Even commerce is sadly injured by it, for it stands in the way of the civilization of Africa, and of a profitable trade with the land. He expressed his fears lest the cause of Abolitionism should have been hindered, by what has been called the "Compromise" between the Northern and Southern States. There has been a pandering to low worldly interest; yielding to base expediency. The importance of the Canadian society and its progress, are not to be estimated by the mere amount of funds—though assuredly it should have been larger—but by the moral impression made by the Anti-Slavery movement. The visits of Mr. Thompson, Mr. Douglass, and other friends have been eminently useful, and the cause now stood on better ground than ever. It is the duty of every man to help it on by individual patronage. It is the cause of man, property in whom belongs to the Creator only. It is the cause of civil and religious liberty, and every man who loves his nature, and desires the good of his fellow creatures, will earnestly desire that the cause may advance triumphantly all the world over. Dr. Burns concluded by moving the following resolution.

1. Resolved, That while we deplore the continued existence of Slavery in the world, and especially in the United States, a system not merely sinful in itself, but the cause of numerous evils, Political, Social, Commercial and Religious, we rejoice in any favourable symptoms that promise its abolition and utter extinction.

PETER FREELAND, Esq., seconded the motion, and it was passed.

The REV. MR. ROAF said, Mr. President, I am about to propose that this meeting, this society, shall, as the committee in the Report have done, take a proper position in reference to the American Colonisation Society. But before I do so I wish to notice an unfortunate course which things in this cause are taking in Great Britain, where our friends are yielding to the idea that American Abolitionism generally is infidel, or at least anti-church, and that our English friends have acted too suspiciously and censoriously with American clergymen and other christians. Sir, I think that we, just outside of the Union, but overlooking them, visiting them, and reading their publications may be understood to know the truth on the matter; and all on this platform, probably all in this Hall, will agree that the American Abolitionists with whom we correspond, are friends of truth, religion and social order, that they separated to found thier society on behalf of these interests, that nothing would more pain them than a sense of having injured the influence of divine revelation and spiritual religion—that, in fact, they are amongst the friends of all that is most forward in morals and christianity. That they have complained of many of the ministers and christians around them as wanting to the cause of Slave Emancipation is true—and that their complaints are just, Sir, I will admit (and I think that our British friends are not fully aware of the fact); I will admit that the work in the States is surrounded with difficulties, that it is a much more serious undertaking than ours was in the British Empire—for here are not merely 800,000 slaves to redeem, but 3,000,000 or 4,000,000—they, too, are not in islands separated from the ruling State, but are in amongst the population, and if emancipated, will, as having all the labour, &c., acquire the property, and in a democracy will, as having the numbers, acquire all political ascendency, and send black representatives to Congress as well as to their State legislatures. Now, to Americans, this all appears intolerable, and yet it has to be done by the very parties whose prejudices and interests and powers are to be sacrificed by it. Our Parliament legislated for distant Colonies and provided £600,000 to £700,000 interest on the £20,000,000 and nobody could resist them—had the thing been left to the Jamaica legislature, it would not have been so readily accomplished. If it is to be advocated, the individual must separate from or rend his church, his church must rend the denomination, the denomination may rend the Union of the States—a martyr's courage and patience are required, and the mighty moral power of christianity is the only influence that can be equal to the case. Yet the question comes, is the work to be done, or is Slavery to be perpetual?

Sir, the evil of Slavery is such that any cost, any peril should be encountered to remove it. It is not a wrong in this or that aspect so much as it is the sum of all villanies. It is licentiousness, fraud, cruelty, pride, idleness ignorance, irreligion—for a truly christian people cannot long be kept slaves. Slavery and prejudice against colour are a schism in the human race, a subversion of the divinely constituted order of things, and a violation of that humanity which has been placed at the head of the creation. Yes, it is not the men alone that are injured, but *humanity*, the distinctive properties and privileges of our race that are insulted and negatived—liberty of choice, and rejection, liberty to act (that power which allies us to God, the abuse of which overthrew our race at first—that power which the sun himself has not, for he is impelled and restrained by mere force). Yes, Sir, liberty of judgment and will is crushed by this system of Slavery. So is the *brotherhood of man* denied to this coloured race, who, for their mere colour, which God himself has instituted, are proscribed, and from some Free States (Indiana for instance) absolutely excluded. The slaves are denied the human distinction *of permanent domestic relations*, and the connection of husband and wife, and parent and child are broken whenever the proprietor chooses. I cannot understand how a minister of God can give his sanction and blessing at the union of a man and woman whose relation is not for life, but during the pleasure of their owners, for that is not marriage. Slavery deprives its victims of knowledge and power, of receiving God's word in the written form in which he gave it. It deprives them of that distinction of the race, a *proprietorship of the soil*, for there can be no ownership when a man may at any moment be sent away for life. Mr. President, a system such as this is not to be tolerated—at any risk and at any loss the people of God should oppose it. Well, sir, do our brethren in the States do this? The greater the difficulty to be overcome, the earlier and more energetic should be their exertions. *What do they?* Why, they find out the faults of their zealous neighbours—cry fie, fie upon strong speaking—lament very blandly the existence of what they daintily call the "peculiar Institution," urge that the Northern States have no power in the matter, and do nothing whatever adapted to shake the system. If they disapprove of the existing abolition organisations, why do they not form others that they would approve? Why not propose the prudent, wise and temperate plan of emancipation? Why be betrayed into such errings as those of Dr. Spring in his noted sermon, into all kinds of palliative and evasory references to the South. Why do they, while their practical opposition to Slavery is light, as a moth's tread on the roof of this building, check and thwart those of their associates whose feelings are impatient of the monster evil? While the Fugitive Slave Bill was before Congress, where were their memorials or meetings against it? Why, Britons would have used influence, held meetings, watched representatives, threatened resistance — rebellion; but no, these Abolitionists, when in England, sat by and contented themselves with good wishes, evidently having a very gentle reluctance, even if they had any at all, to accept the hateful bill, with its accompanying compromise measures. Sir, this Christian "salt has lost its savour, and wherewith shall it be salted?" There is a Christian energy equal to the demands of even this case: the spirit which led two missionaries in Antigua to sell themselves into Slavery in order to get access to the slaves—the spirit which led missionaries to enter the fatal leprosy pen in Africa, in order to die telling the dying of a Saviour—the spirit which came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister," that is what is wanted. I would not say, as some do, that these clergymen are pro-Slavery, any more than I would that they are Abolitionists—they are not the *thieves*, but the *Levite* to the black man, who fell amongst slaveholders and wounded and stripped him—they go by upon the other side, perhaps sentimentally pitying him, but, at all events, leaving him alone. My resolution is to the following effect:

2. Resolved, That, in common with Wilberforce, Buxton, Macaulay, and their associates and successors, we have no confidence in the American Colonisation Society, founded, and chiefly supported, as it has been, by slaveholders—the worst enemies of Freedom and of the Slave, whose welfare they pretend to be anxious to promote by expatriation to Liberia.

Sir, the Colonisation Society proposes to send the free people (not the slaves, mind ye) to Liberia, or the coast of Africa. Sometimes they say this is for the benefit of Africa—these "black rascals," the "worst part of God's creation, being missionaries of Christianity, civilization, and commerce!" Why not send real missionaries, if the welfare of the country there is the object? Why, indeed; it is because, as was commonly said at the founding of the Society, the object is *to get rid of the free blacks*, and therefore it was urged that, if not to Africa, yet to some other place out of the States they should be sent. These people are the natural friends of the slave, sympathize with him, keep before him examples of liberty, and improvement—give him ideas, and may, in an emergency, be dangerous—so they must go. But sometimes we hear that this is for the benefit not of Africa so much as of the expatriated people themselves. But they (most stupid people!) do not understand their own interests, and universally disbelieve it. It may be asked, why, if the welfare of these poor people is sought, why not settle them upon some of the waste lands of the West? Oh, there is the rub; they would be a refuge for others, and grow to be a Territory, and then become a State, and then send black gentlemen into Congress!! Well, then, when people prove incredulous on these points, it is argued that colonisation will help abolition. Yes, sending out a few scores a year does actually lessen the number of the blacks, who, after all this spoon-baling out of Ontario, increase at the rate of 70,000 per annum. Absurd, sir, absurd! "They all with one consent began to make excuse—one went to see a piece of land *after* he had bought it, instead of *before*; another went to prove a yoke of oxen *after* he had bought them." Mr. President, the fact is, this colonisation scheme was devised by Southern slave-owners, it is controlled by them now, it is shunned by Abolitionists, white and black. It is founded on *aversion to the colour*—for while it is *coaxing* out and *persecuting* out the coloured race, it is *inviting* in all the world besides. It draws off from real abolition much of the sympathy which religion is creating for the slave. It raises the value of slave labour, and thus of slave property, by removing the competing and more valuable free labour which is in its neighbourhood. It pretends to send the coloured race out *with their own consent*—but, then, it forces that consent by persecution most shameful. They are now actually seeking from Congress a largess of three or four millions of dollars to establish what they call the *Ebony Line of Steamers* to Liberia, where the people are to be benevolently placed down on a slip of land between the Atlantic Ocean and a continent of barbarism and heathenism. Somehow these Slavery folks have a constant tendency to use peculiarly the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*—they talk not of slaves, but of men "fugitives from service," men "held to labour"—and they mean not merely to give them labour, but to whip them, prevent their getting knowledge, feed them anyhow as the master pleases, separate husbands and wives, parents and children, sell them, send them to distant States, &c., &c., and yet talk of their being "held to labour." So to hunt out freemen to another continent merely because of a colour which God gives them, is colonisation! Very soft, indeed—and like their tender language about slaveholders—all their *fortitude* seems to be expended in bearing the world's scorn and abusing Abolitionists. Mr. President, there is not one of God's attributes in favour of their system. I propose the resolution.

R. H. BRETT, Esq., seconded the resolution.

MR. GEORGE BROWN, M. P. P., rose to move the next resolution:

3. Resolved, That while we would gratefully record our thanks to those Clergymen and others in the United States, who have so nobly exposed the atrocities of the Fugitive Slave Law—we deplore the indifference of some and the unrighteous approbation of others whose duty it is to vindicate the Gospel of Christ from the aspersions of those who represent it as a shield for cruelty and injustice.

He said: Mr. Chairman, I recollect when I was a very young man I used to think that if I had ever to speak before such an audience as this, I would choose African Slavery as my theme, before any other topic. The subject seemed to afford the widest scope for rhetoric, and for fervid appeals to the best of human sympathies. These thoughts, Sir, arose far from here, while Slavery was a thing at a distance, while the horrors of the system were unrealised, while the mind received it as a tale and discussed it as a principle. But when you have mingled with the thing itself, when you have encountered the atrocities of the system, when you have seen three millions of human beings held as chattels by their Christian countrymen, when you have seen the free institutions, the Free Press and the Free Pulpit of America linked in the unrighteous task of upholding the traffic, when you have realised the manacle and the lash and the slot-hound—you think no more of rhetoric. The mind stands appalled at the monstrous iniquity, mere words lose their meaning, and facts, cold facts, are felt to be the only fit arguments (cheers). In regard to the resolution I have read, this is especially the case—I am to speak of the Fugitive Slave Bill of 1851, and if we search the Statute-books of the world, I know not where we shall find its parallel. Every one knows how this Bill came into existence. The slaves of the South were daily escaping into the Northern States, and once there they were almost beyond reach of their masters. True, there was a law usually construed to enable the slaveholder to recover his *property* in any part of the Union; but it had to be effected by due process of law, and public feeling in the North was rapidly becoming sensitive to the degradation of permitting the slave-catcher to drag men into life bondage from the farms of the North. A party had also arisen calling themselves Free Soilers, who took up the position that the slaveholders had no right to follow the refugee into the Free States, that the moment the slave put his foot on the Free North his shackles fell from his limbs. They said to the South, we respect your State Rights, but you must respect ours—you may keep Slavery on your own ground, but you must not bring it here (cheers). It was a bold movement and a noble one, and had it been firmly carried out throughout the Northern States, Slavery would soon have fallen before it. But the South was aroused—the "peculiar institution" was in danger—the cotton interest in the North was alarmed—new and more stringent laws for the protection of the slave-owner and of the slave-catcher were demanded from Congress under the penalty of a disruption of the Union. Northern merchants quailed before the ire of the South, *dough-face* politicians trembled for their party alliances, aspirants for the Presidency pandered for Southern votes—and the Fugitive Slave Bill was passed as a "compromise measure," to the lasting disgrace of Republican America (cheers). Let me recite the provisions of this infamous enactment. In the first place, it enabled the slaveholder or his agent, to seize his "chattel" wherever he found him, *without any warrant*. You cannot arrest a criminal of the deepest dye without a warrant, but a man who is guilty of no crime but his colour, can be seized at any moment without any form of law (hear, hear). In the next place, this law forbids the freemen of the North from showing charity to the refugee. Any one knowingly aiding a Fugitive Slave, is subjected to a fine of $1000 and six months imprisonment in the common jail, and to a civil suit for damages of $1000. What a mockery of liberty! Punish a man as a criminal, in the American Republic, because he sympathizes with the bondman and helps him to be free (cheers)! Another remarkable feature of this Bill is, that the carrying out of its provisions was taken from the State authority, and handed over to the Federal officers. The slaveholders felt that their only safety was in placing the trust in the hands of men looking to Washington for their orders. The United States' Marshals were made the chief man-catchers of their respective districts—the United States' Court Commissioners the judges in all cases arising under the Bill. And these functionaries are bound by the severest penalties to carry out the law. The Marshal is made personally responsible, in the sum of $1000, for the escape of any slave committed to his care, however guiltless he may have been of the escape, or however efficiently he may have acted. In all other cases, civil or criminal, Sheriffs and other public officers are only held responsible for their fidelity and diligence—it was left for the Fugitive Bill to punish a man for that which he did not do, and could not avert. Then again the Bill compels the free Northerners to turn out at the bidding of any Southern miscreant who claims a coloured person for his property, and to aid in hunting him down like a beast of prey, and send him back to bondage. Let not Northerners speak of their *free* States after this—they have no free States. Theirs is the most degrading of Slavery. Professing to abjure the atrocious system—for the sake of their dollars, they permit the South to put its insulting foot upon their necks, they allow their free homesteads to be made the hunting ground of the man-stealer (cheers). The bold villany of the South is not half so revolting as the despicable subserviency of the North. But another provision of the Fugitive Bill is, that it suspends the *habeas corpus*, not toward all Fugitives, but in regard to all men *claimed* as fugitives, be they bond or free—and it forbids them the right of trial by jury. Certain Commissioners are named the judges, and they must decide "summarily." In a suit of ten dollars, one must have due notice and time to prepare for trial, and may demand the decision of twelve impartial jurors—but a man in the model Republic is sent into life bondage by the summary fiat of one individual, and he too, under the full influence of the slave-power, and holding his emoluments under its favour (hear, hear). Let it be well understood that the boasted institutions of the United States demand the greatest care and ceremony about the ownership of a horse or a cow, but make the fate of a human being a matter of "summary" decision—that there is far more difficulty in sending a hog to its stye, than in tearing a man unsuspected of crime from the home of his children, and making him a slave for life. But even a worse feature of the Bill is, that the witnesses are not required to be put into the witness-box in open Court, and cross-examined, so that perjury may be discovered; this would be necessary for the pettiest suit for dollars, but for the enslaving of a man the proceedings may be held in the privacy of a Commissioner's room, and the issue may be decided on paper affidavits, taken *ex parte*, thousands of miles away (hear, hear). Nay, more than this—not content with securing every facility for catching the poor stricken fugitive, not content with selecting the most sure tools to carry out the law—not content with setting aside every legal and constitutional protection for individual rights—this infamous Bill absolutely provides, as far as a law can provide, for a decision favourable to the man-catcher. The Southerners knew the weak point of the North, and they appealed to it; they knew the class of men who were to be the Commissioners—and they provided that when one of these functionaries decided for the slave, he should get a fee of $5, but when he decided for the slaveholder he should have $10 (cries of oh! oh! and hear, hear). Could legislation be more infamous than this! And the best of all is, that the expenses of the slave-catching operation come from the public Treasury, in the recovery of things—aye, even in the defence of personal rights secured by Law—the suitor must pay for the costs; but the model republic stands so firmly for human bondage, that for it there is an exception, and the slaveholder's victim may be taken to his place of torture at the public cost. Free Northerners are made man-catchers, Northern laws are suspended, Northern Judges are bribed to convict at five dollars a man, Northern Marshals are made slave jailers, Northern constables carry home the victim, and Northern taxation pays the cost of process (hear). Tell me no more of your free Northern States—did the true spirit of liberty exist, an enactment such as this would be laughed to scorn, and an attempt to carry it out rouse a feeling at the North which would shake the foundations of the "peculiar institutions." No—the full guilt of the Law rests upon the North. In the house of the Representatives which adopted it, there were 141 Northern members and only 91 from the South. There was a sufficient number of absentees, of skulking voters, on the final division, to have upset the Bill. And the assent of the first branch of the Legislature was given to it by a Northern President—by a citizen of Buffalo (hear). But let me speak of the fruits of the Bill. Scarcely had it passed when the South was awake—affidavits were duly prepared—and the man-thief on the track of the fugitive. Advertisements for runaway's were widely published, and let me read you a sample. [Mr. Brown here read an advertisement, entitled, "Catch the minister! $250 for any one who will cath a Methodist Preacher!" and which went on to describe the party in the most minute manner.] And it was not long ere a victim was found. A coloured man named Hamlet, who had resided in New York for three years, a member of the Methodist Church, having a wife and family, sober, industrious, and faithful to his employers, was seized on the affidavit of a Mrs. Brown, of Baltimore, that he was her property. This woman was not able to write, but signed her mark. She could not of course know of her own knowledge what the writing contained which she signed, but yet, on that affidavit, with the additional evidence of her son and son-in-law, who it is believed were the only parties to be benefitted by the result, Hamlet was torn from his family, and sent into Slavery (hear, hear). He was the first victim, and the North was not yet accustomed to its fetters—so the price of the chattel was subscribed—Mrs. Brown got her eight hundred dollars, and Hamlet came back a man (cheers). Very soon after this a coloured man named Gibson was arrested in Philadelphia as the slave Emery Rice. The New York *Commercial Advertiser*, a pro-Slavery paper, tells us that the case came before Commissioner Ingraham—that the prisoner's counsel demanded time to obtain witnesses to prove that Gibson was a free man, but that Ingraham "refused the application and ordered a summary hearing." The case proceeded and one Price was called as a witness. The *Advertiser* tells us he knew the prisoner to be Rice "by his familiar looks," but that he only inferred him to be Mr. Knight's slave because he rode Mr. Knight's horse, and had seen him work for him. Mr. Commissioner Ingraham ruled that when a coloured person worked for a slaveholder in Maryland the presumption was that he was a slave—though the witness admitted that many free coloured men were thus employed. Price admitted also that he himself was bound over from the Sessions on a charge of kidnapping, and *this man was the only witness who identified the prisoner*. An hour's delay was asked, but refused by Commissioner Ingraham, although informed that the prisoner had been kept in ignorance of the real cause of his arrest until he appeared in court. Here was a scene! Two witnesses, coloured, were, however, obtained—men of good character—who testified respectively that the prisoner's name was Adam Gibson, that he was formerly a slave of a Dr. Davis, who liberated all his slaves by his will. The commissioner, nevertheless, had "no doubt of the identity of the prisoner with Emery Rice," and ordered him to be returned to Mr. Knight. This was in a Free State of the American Union—in the land of Wm. Penn, in the city of Brotherly Love! A human being condemned into Slavery for life on the oath of a professional man-stealer that he had once seen him on Mr. Knight's horse (hear, hear)! Behold a Republican spectacle of the year 1851. Well, what was the *finale* of this transaction? Ingraham got his ten dollars, the *posse comitatus* was called out to enforce the law. Northern men took the victim to his claimant and presented him as a chattel—but the slave-dealer had not villany enough to receive him. He acknowledged that they had brought the wrong man—that Mr. Commissioner Ingraham's victim was not Emery Rice (cheers). What a picture was this! Northern justice prostituted—a Judge of a Free State, a Northern Marshal, the free citizens of Pennsylvania, all crouching before Southern despotism, rolling in the mire of their own debasement, urging the slaveholder to take a victim—and the dealer in human flesh shrinking from the judicial award! After this came the case of Henry Long, in the city of New York. He was brought before a sham commissioner and kept before him until arrested under a valid authority; he was tried and condemned, and sent to Virginia—and he was sold there with the special condition that northern benevolence should never reach him, that he was never to be transferred to a northern owner (hear, hear). Rapidly after this came a scene of blood in the State of Pennsylvania. The Philadelphia *Bulletin* tells us that "Deputy Marshal Hatzell, Constable Agen, and four or five other men, proceeded to Chester county to hunt up a chattel. They arrived at the house where the fugitive was supposed to be secreted, and knocked at the door. A coloured woman opened the window to know their business, when she was informed that they had broken the traces of their wagon and wished a light to mend them. She came down stairs and admitted the party in waiting. They thus effected an entrance and were proceeding up stairs, when they were met by two coloured men and two coloured women. The women and one of the men were armed with axes, and the other had a gun. The Marshal told them that they were in search of a fugitive slave: but they refused to let him or any of his men enter the room. The gun was taken from the man, and the party endeavoured to disarm the man with the axe. The pistol was fired at him, the ball of which must have entered his breast, but he still maintained his resistance. The fight continued until the Southern *gentleman* (so says the *Bulletin*), who was with the party, advised the Marshal to withdraw, remarking that he would not have one of them killed for all the negroes in Pennsylvania. The party retired firing several shots as they went, and more than one coloured person is supposed to have been shot. One was seen to fall as the officers were leaving. None of the Marshal's party were injured." Here was a spectacle in Christian America! Northern officials acting as slot-hounds on the track of human beings charged with no crime! decoying the poor victims from their lair by appeals to their benevolence! shooting them down like beasts of prey because they love liberty! And mark the cowardice of the transaction. A posse of seven men and a Southern *gentleman*, all armed to the teeth, driven off by two women and a man with axes and another man disarmed. Show me a tyrant and I will find you a coward (cheers). They had not the courage to go forward, they turned and ran from the poor slaves, but when beyond the reach of the axe, they fired their guns at their victors, with the full intent of murder. After this we had the case of the Crafts, who are now happily in a land where no slave can live (cheers). They were closely hunted in the city of Boston, but they escaped to England. Then came the case of Shadrach, who was seized and brought before a Massachusetts judge, but some how or other, there arose an excitement in the Court-room—the Marshal was jostled and the Constables hemmed in—the law was trampled under foot—but the chattel escaped and is now a free man, in free Canada (cheers). Shortly after came the famous Sims case, also in the city of Boston. Alas, that there should be tracklers to Slavery in old Boston, but let us admit that the State of Massachusetts is a redeeming feature in the whole case—there are true men there yet—the blood of their ancestors yet beats in their veins (loud cheering). When Sims was arrested, Boston was roused to excitement—the Court-house was surrounded with thronging thousands, and to preserve the sanctity of the law, an iron chain had to be carried round the Court-house, and a large Police force ranged within it to keep off the mob. When the judges entered their Court, they had to crouch under that iron chain! Of old the conquered had to pass under the yoke as an admittal of their conquest—and was it not a fitting emblem of Northern servitude to their Southern masters, that the Judges of New England had to pass under an iron chain, ere they could ascend the Bench (loud cheers)! Sims was convicted of being a chattel—and he was ordered to be sent back to Georgia. Boston men did the deed. A Boston marshal caught the victim, a Boston judge condemned him, Boston men were his jailors and carried him into Slavery. What a picture of degradation! [Mr. Brown detailed other cases which arose under the operation of the Fugitive Law, and proceeded] Had these occurred in Algiers, or among the savage tribes of Africa, the whole world would have been roused to indignation—but as they are daily occurrences in Christian America—in the Free Northern States of America—in the land of Sabbaths and Churches, and Schools, and Missionary Societies, no man must ope his mouth to its iniquity! Where in the wide world could such transaction as these be openly practised, but in this boasted land of liberty?

A VOICE—In Hungary!

In Hungary, does the gentleman say? I thank him for the allusion. To their eternal disgrace the Austrians flogged women in Hungary, but they brought down on their heads the denunciations of the whole civilized world. And what comparison is there between the cases? Despotic Austria flogs a woman, but free America sells her into life bondage under all the penalties to which woman can be subject (cheers). Many a noble woman would submit to be flogged as a martyr to the cause of Liberty, but what true woman would dare to live under all the unspeakable atrocities of American Slavery (loud cheers)? Sir, I have said that there are true men, noble spirits in the Northern States who did not witness these things unmoved; but that the full guilt of the iniquity rests on the North, no man can doubt. When a feeling of resistance to the Fugitive Bill began to show itself, who were the men most forward to crush it? Northern Merchants, Northern Editors, Northern Politicians—aye, northern Ministers of Christ. The cry of the "Union in danger" was got up—the American constitution was openly declared to have higher claims to obedience than God's moral law, and popular meetings were held throughout the Union to pronounce in favour of the Fugitive atrocity. A mass meeting was held in the city of New York, and the great Daniel Webster, the "Godlike Daniel," as he was once styled—was brought there for the occasion. In his speech to the New Yorkers, Mr. Webster, while considering the cry for the repeal of the Fugitive Bill, told them the President "considered the settlement as final," and he would "carry it into full effect." Mr. Webster continued thus: "This is a subject, gentlemen, on "which the moral sense of the country ought to re-"ceive tone and tension. There ought to be a stern "rebuke by public opinion, of all who would re-open "this agitating question—who would break the "truce, as they call it—who would arm again and "renew the war." The New York papers tell us this was received by the audience with "applause and cheers." Think of northern men applauding when told that that is a "final settlement," which makes them the slave-catchers of the "southern chivalry." It is often said that Slavery cannot be so bad a thing, for that slaves who have escaped are glad to get back to bondage; if such cases do ever occur, it presents one of the most startling features of the vile system, that it actually degrades men so low that they know not the difference between Slavery and freedom (cheers). But these New York people bring us new testimony to the demoralising influence of Slavery; they show that it blunts all the nobler feelings in those who are but indirectly connected with it—that men born and reared in the Free North can rejoice to pass under the yoke of the South, and give "loud cheers" when they are told by the man that subjugated them that their degradation is to be perpetual (cheers). But the great guilt of Slavery lies at the door of the American churches. Truly did Albert Barnes say "there is no power out of the church that could sustain Slavery one hour, if it were not sustained in it" (hear). But nearly all the churches of the Union are steeped in its iniquities—ministers, office-bearers and people are alike its upholders. In every shape you can find it, from the smooth-tongued parson who preaches that Slavery is "not a sin *per se*" down to the bold denunciator of the "fanatic Abolitionist," with stipend paid him from the toil of the poor slave. How can the state of the American church be better described than by the fact that Dr. Spring, an eminent light of the Presbyterian church, and minister of a large congregation in New York, publicly made this declaration: "IF BY ONE PRAYER I COULD FREE EVERY SLAVE IN THE WORLD, I COULD NOT OFFER IT" (hear, hear)! Laboured arguments are constantly coming from evangelical Northern pulpits palliating the system—nice criticisms on God's law in regard to it; but for my part I cannot listen to such arguments—I sweep aside all such theological humbug and find a solution of the whole question in the grand Christian rule—"DO UNTO OTHERS AS YOU WOULD BE DONE UNTO" (loud cheering). It is much to be regretted, that Christian men in Great Britain are so slow to comprehend the position of the American church on this question—that with it rests the fate of the traffic. It is said that Methodist church MINISTERS and MEMBERS hold 219,563 slaves, Presbyterians 77,000, Baptists 125,000, Campbellites 101,000, Episcopalians 88,000, and other denominations 50,000. Total slaves held by professing Christian 666,563. Let these churches declare Slavery a heinous sin in the sight of God, let them compel the man-stealer to choose between God and mammon—and how long would Slavery exist.

The first time I ever entered an American church was in the city of New York—a Presbyterian church. A friend who was with me went into one pew and I entered another. Immediately I noticed several persons staring at him in a particular manner, and at last a gentleman rose, went to one of the office-bearers, whispered and pointed at my friend. The second gentleman left his pew, went to my friend and most politely conducted him forward to another seat. Both of us attributed the circumstance at first to courtesy, but we soon learnt that we had got into the black pew, in which no white man should be degraded to worship his Maker (hear, hear). The thing is too common to be denied—and that at the sacramental table, the black christian must sit apart from his white brother worm. Sir, I must apologize for detaining the audience so long, but one word more and I have done. The question is often put, What have we in Canada to do with American Slavery? Sir, we have everything to do with it. It is a question of humanity, and no man has a right to refuse his aid, whatever it may be, in ameliorating the woes of his fellow-men (cheers). It is a question of Christianity, and no christian can have a pure conscience who hesitates to lift his voice against a system which, under the sanction of a Christian altar, sets at defiance every principle of Christianity (cheers). We have to do with it on the score of self-protection. The leprosy of the atrocious system affects all around it, it leavens the thoughts, the feelings, the institutions of the people who touch it. It is a barrier to the spread of Liberal principles. Who can talk gravely of liberty and equality in the States, while Slavery exists? Every intelligent American who professes to be a Christian and upholds Slavery is committed to a glaring infidelity which must lead him continually astray, in trying to square with it his every day conduct (cheers). We are alongside of this great evil—our people mingle with it—we are affected by it now and every day enhances the evil. In self-protection then we are bound to use every effort for his abolition, that our people may not be contaminated by its withering moral influence (cheers). And, Sir, there is another reason why we have to do with Slavery. We are in the habit of calling the people of the United States, "the Americans"—but we too are Americans—on us as well as on them, lies the duty of preserving the honour of this continent (cheers). On us, as on them, rests the noble trust of shielding Free Institutions from the reproach of modern tyrants. Who that looks at Europe, given over to the Despots, and with but one little island yet left to uphold the flag of freedom—can reflect without emotion, that the great Republic of this Continent nurtures a despotism more base than them all (cheers). How crushingly the upholders of tyranny in other lands, must turn on the friends of liberty: "Behold your free institutions," they must say—"look at the American Republic proclaiming all men to be born free and equal, and kee

glad tidings to the poor—to heal the broken-hearted—to preach deliverance to the captives—and to set at liberty them that are bruised." How, therefore, the professed preachers of the gospel could advocate Slavery and defend the Fugitive Slave Law was to him inexplicable. Yet, it was to be lamented that there have been clergymen of the highest standing in Society—men of education, talent and experience, who have taken such a position. Among these the Rev. Dr. Spring of New York, the author of the work entitled "the obligation of the world to the Bible" has been named as having publicly declared that "could he by offering up one prayer to the Almighty secure the abolition of Slavery throughout the world, he would not do it." Such a fact was calculated to shake all confidence in the theological system of the day but not in the Bible. Wherever it was diffused and read by the people, he had no fear of the emancipation of men from all bondage. Its doctrines when understood and believed, necessarily lead to deliverance from all Slavery, whether it be mental, moral, social and political. He remarked that the principle involved in the Fugitive Slave Law was to be traced to the Constitution of the United States, and it was confirmed by an Act of Congress in 1793. The law of 1851 was but the reiteration of the principle admitted in the Constitution, that Fugitive Slaves should be given up by the Free States—yet it was reiterated under circumstances of the deepest atrocity and wickedness as had been clearly shown by the mover of the Resolution. Both the clause in the American Constitution and these acts of Congress he regarded as immoral; yet he believed that many persons, who were friends of emancipation, had conscientious scruples in resisting a Constitution and laws they had sworn to uphold.

Rev. S. R. Ward moved the following resolution in an able and eloquent speech, of which we regret our inability to give a report:

4. Resolved, That as British subjects, and enjoying the blessings of Freedom, we rejoice that Canada is so favourably situated for affording shelter and protection to the poor persecuted American, flying from the grasp of his heartless countrymen.

Dr. Russell said—Mr. Chairman, in rising to second the resolution, I may remark that this black subject of Slavery has been done so brown already that it is unnecessary for me further to occupy the time of the meeting. Had the hour not been so late, I should have liked to have met an objection which is too often made to our movement, viz.: that we in Canada have nothing to do with Slavery. I think it may be proved from history and from the very nature of man, that no great wrong or suffering can be endured by any portion of the human race without the whole family of man being either directly or indirectly involved in it. In fact the question of our being concerned with the subject of Slavery is not one of our *will*—it is one established in the very nature of things. Some people seem to be morally offended at so many coloured people coming amongst us; for my own part, sir, I have no respect for the institutions of this or any other country any further than they have a tendency to protect the liberties and develope the faculties of man. The tendencies of my mind are all democratic; and it is for this—for the respect I bear to the great principles of human liberty, proclaimed by the American Declaration of Independence, that I detest the Slavery of the United States more than I would that of any other nation. The Fugitive Slave Law proves *that* people to be traitorous to the principles upon which their Republic is founded; and the passage of that law made me feel an emotion of loyalty to my country that I never felt before. Is it any wonder that we do feel a sentiment of reverence for the name of Queen Victoria when we see the poor, the despised, the down-trodden refugees from republican—no, it is not republican, but despotic avarice, finding a shelter and a home of liberty under the Royal Arms. I, sir, am proud of Canada under such circumstances; and as for being annoyed at so many coloured people coming among us, I would ask, who gave us the privilege of being annnoyed at any such thing? The coloured people settled here have just as much right to be offended at the poor emigrants for coming from England, Scotland, or Ireland, and with greater justice, may the Indian race denounce and condemn the white man for invading their soil and driving them from their homes and graves of their fathers. For my own part, while the glorious sun shines in the vault of heaven for the benefit of all—while the clouds send down showers to fructify and beautify the earth—while there are trees of the forest, the almost boundless forest to the north and west, waiting for willing hearts and strong arms to attack and cut down—while there is seed to be sown and harvests to be reaped; nay, more, sir, while there are stubborn stumps of false pride, prids prejudice and bigotry, founded upon distinctions that are only skin-deep, to be rooted out—I for one will always be happy to give the welcoming hand of fellowship to my coloured brother. And these who have just listened to the eloquent address of Mr. Ward—who has appealed to the higher sentiments of our nature in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," must be convinced that we are the benefitted party by such fellowship. Sir, I beg cordially to second the resolution.

Rev. Professor Esson moved the following resolution, seconded by John Arnold, Esq.:

5. Resolved, That we highly appreciate the self-denying labours of the Members of the "Ladies Association, for the Relief of destitute Coloured Fugitives," and tender them our best thanks for their efficient co-operation in the work of philanthrophy and love.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

†† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* Francis Jackson, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1852.

FULFILLING THE COMPROMISE.

The Newspaper and the Telegraph have carried all over the country, ere this, the intelligence that, during the past week, the Compromise has again been fulfilled in this city, and that a Southern barracoon has again closed its doors, for safe-keeping, upon a new-made slave, who for years had been a citizen of a Northern State. Our readers we refer to another column for the details of this transaction.

There is no human being on whom the hand of God has not at some time fallen more or less heavily. "Man is born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward," and few are they in whose hearts does not lie deep down a grief, hidden, perhaps, to others, but which no time nor circumstance can ever bury out of their own sight. Here, more than any where else, is fastened the chord that vibrates in every human bosom to the touch of suffering and sorrow, and which makes the strongest bond that binds man, whether he wills it or not, to his brother man. And feeling this, knowing that the thousands upon thousands who throng this crowded city have been thus taught the great lesson of pity, it is marvellous in our eyes how such a thing as this, which has just been done, could be done, and men go on without pause, and without thought of it, in their daily buying and selling; that wives and mothers should busy themselves as cheerily as ever for their husband's and their children's comfort; that on the Day of Rest, following such a deed, when, professing to forget their daily cares, and to give their thoughts to their duty to God and their fellow-men, they could hasten, as usual, to all their churches, and neither ask for nor hear from a single pulpit one prayer for mercy or for vengeance from an insulted Heaven. But were the man *white* who has thus been torn from the bosom of his wife and the arms of his little child; were the woman, thus worse than widowed, of unmarried blood: were the child, thus made an orphan, without the taint of African descent; the quiet that would then, as now, reign over us would not be the quiet of apathy, but of the still rage that precedes a dreadful retribution. The Union that did such things would be broken as a rope of sand; the Church that is silent now, would appeal, when no appeal was needed, with the power almost of a divine voice, to the consciences and the hearts of the people; and the Trade which was bought at such a price would be sent whence it came. But alas! Horace Preston is a *black* man; his wife is not altogether a white woman; and their child is not a white child. So his goes—legally, illegally it matters not, to never-ending bondage; she and her little one are left to moan and moan over their desolate hearth-stone, and the city goes its way, and asks no questions, nor even cares to ask them.

Yet, ten days ago, this husband and father went home from his daily toil to a peaceful and happy household. The dark cloud of fear had doubtless rolled away with the passing years, till it had become a mere speck in his horizon, and his humble path was opening bright before him, while contentment rested with him all his days. It was but little that he asked. He prayed that no hunter of men might come to molest him and make him afraid, but that it might be granted to him to win, by honest labour, his daily bread, and be let alone. But suddenly, and like a thief in the night—verily, as thieves, and in the night, came the slave-hunters; they seized him; they imprisoned him; they mocked him with a trial; and, in four days, they tore him from all that made life worth having, and sent him where even life is a heavy burden. So desolation and despair sat at the fireside where tranquillity and happiness had reigned a few hours before; the husband and the wife, the father and the child, were parted forever, though not by death. But the Compromise was fulfilled, and the bonds of the Union that rates Cotton so high, and men so low, were drawn, so it is hoped, closer than ever.

The facts of this case need no exaggeration to render them more hideous and appalling than they are in reality. In the whole range of varied human affliction, no more terrible calamity, except sometimes such as may result from crime, could fall upon innocent beings than this which has been inflicted, and solely by human agency, upon these poor, but estimable and respectable people. The wife, through the three days of her husband's trial, was, whenever she was permitted to be so, at his side. The agony of her sorrow, as she kneeled before him and hid her convulsed features from the sight of men, though its mute and touching eloquence was lost upon the miscreants in whose hands lay the destiny of her life, showed, nevertheless, how deeply the iron was entering her soul, and the depth of the soul into which it entered. The wretchedness of many common lives was compressed into the few brief moments of their parting. Terrible and unutterable as that sorrow is which all, sooner or later, have to suffer when they watch for the last breath of those they love, their hearts bear it without breaking, only because the blow comes from an unseen power, from which there can be no appeal. There is the submission of impotence, if not of will. But it was not death which was tearing her husband from her arms. No mysterious and divine power here was manifesting itself, to reduce her to the common level of suffering inseparable from our nature. The terror and the agony which come with Death were there but Death was not. The hand of God was not stretched out between her and him she loved more than her own life It was the cruelty and the cupidity of man only that came between them. One wanted a slave; others, one for the base ten dollar bribe of the law, and another for some price more or less paltry, were willing to give him one; and so, by a decree as inexorable and as cruel as death, but without its inevitable necessity, the husband and the wife were suddenly and forever parted. Who can measure the depth of that woe which has no possible allevintion? Yet this calamity, so removed out of and above the range of common sorrow, has almost no appeal for a people whose hearts and whose consciences are seared by the deadening influence of Slavery, and whose eyes and ears are dazzled and dizzined by the glare and din of Trade. The trio who consented to be the instruments of this outrage, Morton, Martin, and Busteed, who, without law, and in spite of law, but in the name of the law, presumed to inflict upon these poor creatures so dire and terrible a misfortune, only ventured to enact their part in the tragedy because they knew that behind them stood an indifferent public, or a public that, if it observed at all, would do so merely with an approving nod.

Shall we believe, then, that there is no retribution for all this? Never, while we have faith in any thing. The rampant power that tramples upon the rights of the humble will not content itself always with these. It may be that the blood of some *white* Virginia must cry from the ground for vengeance ere the people will arouse themselves to a knowledge of what and how much they put in jeopardy by submission and indifference to a law which delivers the humblest among them to the worst form of despotism. But as sure as there is a progress in human events, and a growth in every form of good and evil, some such terrible awakening is in store for them, unless they forestall it by remembering in time that in the rights of one, even the poorest and most despised, are involved the rights of all, even the proudest and most prosperous.

HOW IT WAS DONE.

Horace Preston, the man who has just been hurried from happy and prosperous freedom to miserable and degrading Slavery, was a resident, as the Report of his trial shows, of Williamsburgh. On Thursday of last week, he was missing from his home, and all that night, and the following day, he was sought for in vain. In being suspected that he had been arrested as a slave, counsel was secured in his behalf, but their endeavours to find his place of confinement, or any commitment against him, were in vain Nothing could be ascertained respecting him till a man called to his wife, who was passing through the Park, we believe, with Mr. Culver, that her husband was then on trial as a fugitive before Commissioner Morton. In an obscure room, and difficult of access, they found this Star Chamber Court in Session.

Preston, it seems, was first arrested on a charge of theft, though it has not yet been shown—and probably cannot be—that there was any legal warrant against him. He was concealed, at first in the Sixth Ward Cells, in the Tombs Building, though not under the direction of the Warden. Thence he was removed to the Second Ward Station House. In the meantime a Telegraphic Dispatch was sent to his alleged owner, who immediately requested that he be detained till he could send an agent. His son arrived the next day, though, as it will be seen by the report, Preston was committed on the affidavit of the counsel for the claimant, Mr. Busteed, who, of course, could not of his own knowledge assert that the man was the slave of his client.

What sort of a trial it was that was given him will be seen by the report, and especially the cards which follow, from his Counsel, and from the Commissioner. That this officer was governed by no other motive than to render the alleged fugitive into the hands of his claimant, as speedily as possible, and to have done with the trial, is made perfectly evident by his own showing. Witnesses were in waiting whom Messrs. Jay and Culver were ready to bring forward to show that Preston was entitled to his freedom, or, at least, to show that a doubt existed of his being legally a slave, when the Commissioner sprung a judgment upon them, to their own surprise and that of the audience, who understood that such evidence would be received if the Commissioner should not grant the motion to quash the indictment. The certificate was made out and given, the protestations and entreaties of Preston's counsel disregarded, while his Honour gathered up his papers and escaped by a back door, in most indecent haste, hardly staying to reply to Mrs. Culver's assurance that "though he might sneak from the Court Room, he could not escape the eyes of the public." Application was then made to Judge Judson for a writ of *habeas corpus*, which he, most characteristically, declined, on the plea of other business, to grant. The subsequent proceedings, more sad than if they had been leading the man out to execution, was then formed, Gen. Henry F. Fallmadge, United States Marshal, taking the lead, following Preston, who was supported on either side by a son of the Marshal, and two policemen bringing up the rear. A hurried adieu was permitted to the heart-broken wife, and a few friends, and the poor fellow was hurried to endless Slavery.

The following cards show in the clearest manner the character of the trial, the closing one of Mr. Emmett, on whose testimony Commissioner Morton relied to substantiate his statement, confirming all that had been before stated by his associates.

CARD OF MESSRS. JAY AND CULVER.

As this case, in which the public have taken some interest, was suddenly terminated this morning by Mr Commissioner Morton giving a certificate for the delivery of the alleged fugitive to the claimant, to be removed to Maryland, without any rebutting evidence being introduced on his behalf, we deem it right to state, in justice to ourselves and as a matter proper to be known, the true facts as they occurred.

On Friday, the attorney for the claimant declared his case closed, and we were asked by the Commissioner to proceed with the examination of witnesses for the defence.

It was said in reply, that before doing so, we would move to dismiss the proceedings on the ground that the original affidavit of the attorney, on which the warrant was issued, and which was made, not on information and belief, but absolutely, to the effect that Preston, a person held to service or labour in Maryland, had escaped therefrom, about the 20th March, 1847, and "that at the time of his escape, his service or labour was due to the said Reese, and that the same has ever since been due to him, and that the said Reese has never parted with, and is still entitled to, such service or labour, and that he is the owner of and entitled to the control of the said Preston," was made, as appeared from the testimony of Mr. Busteed, on his cross-examination, without any personal knowledge of the facts sworn to—and that the other testimony for the claimant was utterly insufficient to prove his title. It was said, further, that if, upon this motion, the Court should decide that the evidence was sufficient to support the claim unless rebutted by proof for the defence, we had a number of witnesses in attendance, besides others whom we had not yet found, but for whom subpœnas had been issued at our application by the Commissioner and placed for service in the hands of the Marshal—but that as our motion to dismiss the proceedings, if granted, would render their examination unnecessary, we proposed to argue that motion first.

This course was not objected to. The motion to dismiss the proceedings, in the nature of a motion to quash or for non-suit, was argued at length with the distinct understanding, thus assented to by the Commissioner, that if that motion was denied, we were to enter upon the defence this morning. Our arrangements were made accordingly, and our witnesses directed to be in attendance.

This morning, at the opening of the Court, the Commissioner delivered his decision, denying the motion, and granting the certificate of removal, taking us altogether by surprise, and refusing to hear our protests against conduct which we regard as absolutely violative of the liberties of the defendant, and of our rights as his counsel.

An affidavit was then made by Mr. Busteed, which, we presume, was an affidavit of danger, for the purpose of procuring for the claimant the escort of the Marshal from New York to Baltimore, and the payment of the expenses from the United States Treasury; but this we do not know positively, as the Commissioner refused our request to be allowed to see it.

Preston was immediately removed from the Court-room, and soon afterward placed in a hack and driven off.

Application for a writ of *habeas corpus* was made to Judge Judson, who refused to hear the motion, on the ground that he was engaged in another case.

We are under the impression that the motion would have been denied, upon the ground stated by Mr. Attorney General Crittenden in his letter to Mr. Fillmore, after the passage of the Fugitive Law of 1850, that "the certificate of a Commissioner is to be regarded as the act of judgment, after a fair and impartial trial of a judicial tribunal, having competent jurisdiction."

How far the conduct of the Commissioner in this case, in admitting all evidence offered for the claimant, of whatever character, including an affidavit made without knowledge, and confessions of the defendant while in duress—his refusal to compel an interested witness to answer on a cross-examination, and his cutting off all opportunity of rebutting evidence by a snap judgment, made in violation of good faith—comports with that strict impartiality and fairness which ought to be preserved in trials involving the right to liberty, is a question which the undersigned submit to the judgment of the community.

E. D. Culver.
New York, April 3, 1852. John Jay.

CARD OF COMMISSIONER MORTON.

I deem it a duty I owe to myself, as well as the public, to reply to the statement under the signature of Messrs. Culver and Jay, in the *Post* of Saturday evening It was on Thursday and not on Friday that the attorney for the claimant declared his case closed, and I then asked Messrs. Culver and Jay if they were prepared to proceed with their testimony. Mr. Culver having stated, in the morning, that he had three witnesses in attendance, and I then offered to sit until ten that evening. The counsel remarked that we had been in session over six hours, and they would prefer going on with their testimony the following morning. Mr. Jay inquired of the counsel for the claimant if he had any more testimony to offer, and asked the Commissioner if he would permit the claimant to introduce further testimony, and was answered that none but rebutting testimony would be admitted. The case was then adjourned until Friday morning, when the council for the fugitive were to produce their testimony.

At the opening of the Court on Friday, the counsel, Messrs. Jay and Emmet (Mr. Culver not being present), had no witnesses in attendance, and subpœnas were issued to the marshal to summon two witnesses—Martin and another person. The counsel for the fugitive had called Mr. Busteed to the stand, and had examined him at considerable length, when, the marshal not being able to summon the witnesses, Mr. Jay argued the case on the part of the fugitive, and Mr. Busteed on the part of the claimant, and Mr. Jay, after going to the Library to obtain the books cited by the opposite counsel, closed his argument in reply; and the commissioner reserved his decision until the following morning.

All the papers that I have seen, in which the proceedings were reported, stated that the testimony was closed, and that certainly was the understanding of the counsel for the claimant as well as myself.

That it was a mere pretext for vexatious delay, and that they had no testimony to offer, I infer from the fact that after the decision was announced, Mr. Emmet, the associate counsel of Mr. Jay, stated in my office, in the presence of another gentlemen, "that it would have been better to have made the offer, to permit them to have gone on, as they had no witnesses to produce, and it would not have occupied over half an hour, and would have been more satisfactory to all concerned."

It is worthy of remark, that the most important statements in the card relate to occurrences which took place when Mr. Culver was not present, and as to the correctness of which he undertakes to vouch in terms as positive as if he was speaking from personal knowledge.

The decision of the Commissioner was based only on the testimony of William D. Reese, and the affidavit of the Attorney, and all confessions of the fugitive were wholly excluded and disregarded, as by a reference to the decision will be apparent. Geo. W. Morton,

CARD OF RICHARD S. EMMET.

A card from Mr. Commissioner Morton, on the subject of this case, intended as an answer to the card of Messrs. Culver and Jay, appears in *The Herald* of this morning. As my name is mentioned in connection with the case, I desire to state my recollection of what occurred.

The first knowledge I had of the case, was from the Friday morning papers, and, as a spectator, I stepped into the room, where the proceedings were going on. I there found Mr. Jay, who informed me that his associate counsel, Mr. Culver, was engaged in another court; which left him as the only counsel for the fugitive. All my sympathies being with him, I readily volunteered to remain with him, although, knowing nothing of the facts, I did not intend to take any active part in the case.

After Mr. Busteed had left the stand, Mr. Jay, upon consultation, moved the discharge of the fugitive, on the ground of the insufficiency of the claimant's proof. This motion was argued at length. And Mr. Jay expressly stated that in case the motion was denied he would be ready to produce witnesses. There was no objection to this by either the Commissioner or the claimant's counsel, and when the adjournment was had I considered that it was perfectly understood by all parties that the fugitive would be at liberty to call witnesses if the motion were decided against him, and I need not say that I was astonished and indignant at the summary disposition of the case, in the face of an offer to produce relevant testimony. After the decision, professional business required my attendance before Mr. Morton, and the conversation turned upon the recent proceedings. I was earnest in my denunciation of what I considered the unjust execution of an unjust law. Mr. Morton justified himself by saying, that he believed that the effect of opening the case would have been to detain him for days or weeks.

I said that I did not know whether the fugitive had any witnesses, and insisted that it was the duty of the Commissioner to entertain the offer of proof, and that it probably would not have taken half an hour to dispose of it. This was the substance of our conversation. I certainly never did assert positively, as Mr. Morton's card would intimate, that the fugitive had no witnesses. I had not been in consultation with Mr. Jay or Mr. Culver, and had not been apprised of the nature of the defence. I have since learned that there were witnesses in attendance.

I would have no objection to the publication of our conversation, as it actually occurred, although I did suppose it to be a private one, but I do object to the impression going abroad, that I in any way approved of the Commissioner's course, or of his decision.

Richard S. Emmet.

New York, April 5, 1852.

BUSTED ON SLAVERY.

One of the counsel of Preston is reported by a morning paper as exclaiming, at an early stage of the recent melancholy trial—"they've got the right counsel this time." The subsequent conduct of the person alluded to—Mr. Busteed—justified the remark. The *Express*, referring to the ruffianly attack upon Mr. Jay in open Court, of which that paper evidently and very naturally approves, suggests to Mr. Busteed that there is a division of sentiment in the community upon the position which he has seen fit to assume The execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, the *Express* thinks, "does not necessarily involve a surrender either of self-respect or of decency," nor is "inconsistent with or compromising the character of a gentleman." We congratulate that paper on having got so far as to take this doubt into consideration, and wish Mr. Busteed all the comfort he can get from the assurance that it is a disputed point.

We presume, however, that that *person*—the doubt does not trouble us, as it does the *Express*—is ready for any crumbs of comfort, or crumbs of any sort, from anybody's table. The remark of the opposite counsel would probably apply to him in any case in which he might be retained. He is the "right counsel" for any thing, nor would his hearty endeavours in any case be wanting because he had, at some former time, professed principles which should make him look with abhorrence upon his present position. Like the Vicar of Bray, he is warmly in favour of the party that will keep him in place. The following correspondence, written three years ago, illustrates the character of the Slave-catching Attorney of to-day.

New York, March 27, 1849.

Richard Busteed, Esq.: Your name has been presented before our Committee as a candidate for Assistant Alderman, at the ensuing Election. Such being the fact, I take the liberty, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, of addressing to you the following interrogatory:

Are you, or are you not opposed to the further extension of Slavery to territories acquired or to be acquired? If opposed, are you in favour of the enactment by Congress of the Jeffersonian Ordinance of 1787, commonly called the "Wilmot Proviso," to prevent the further extension of Slavery?

Our Committee meet this afternoon to complete their nominations, and an early answer is solicited.

Respectfully, yours, &c., E. J. Leete.
One of the Nom. Committee of the XVIIIth Ward.

Saturday, March 27, 1849.

To Edgar J. Leete, Esq., *one of the Nominating Committee of the Eighteenth Ward:*

Sir—Your favour of this date, informing me that my name has been presented to your Committee as a candidate for Assistant Alderman of the Eighteenth Ward at the ensuing election, has been received, and in accordance with your wishes I thus early reply to it, and to the interrogatory you therein address to me

With my present views on the subject, and in the light of the best information I have been enabled to acquire, I answer that I am opposed to the extension of Slavery in territory that is now free, possessed by the United States, or to free territory which our country may hereafter acquire, and *I am in favour of the enactment by Congress of any ordinance, the effect of which will be to prevent the further extension of so great an evil as Slavery.* An ordinance such as the mind of Jefferson would have framed, whether known as the Wilmot Proviso or by any other name, would meet my hearty approval.

I may be pardoned for saying in plain terms that while I believe in the manifest superiority of the White over the African race, *I am yet heartily opposed to the system by which man holds his fellow in servitude and perpetual bondage.* This feeling in no partakes of the nature of inevitable blood, as you will see when I tell you that my father, previous to his leaving St. Lucia, one of the West India Islands, and long before the act of British emancipation, manumitted all the slaves which he owned during his residence there.

I am no politician, and in the obnoxious sense of the term I trust I never shall be—and this must be my apology if I have traveled out of the legitimate issue involved in your interrogatory,

I am, sir, with respect, yours, &c,
Richard Busteed.

MASSACHUSETTS ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

On the 27th ulto., Mr. Sewall, of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, reported, on behalf of the special Committee on the Resolutions of Delaware, a bill for the further protection of personal liberty, giving a trial by jury to persons claimed as fugitive slaves. Should the bill become a law, it must result in a collision between the Federal and State Governments, as it clearly conflicts with the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, as well as with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Prigg case. Probably the framers of the bill wish, in this manner, to test the constitutionality of the law, and the soundness of that decision.

The Bill is as follows:

And act further to protect personal liberty

Sec. 1. The governor, by and with the advice and consent of the council, shall appoint, in every county, one or more commissioners learned in the law, whose duty it shall be, in their respective counties, when any person in this State is arrested or seized, or in danger of being arrested or seized as a fugitive slave, on being informed thereof, diligently and faithfully to use all lawful means to protect, defend, and procure the discharge of every such person.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the clerks of courts in their respective counties, and of any justice of the peace in any county in which any person may be arrested or imprisoned as a fugive slave, on the petition of any such commissioners or any other persons setting forth that he is informed and believes that any person, whose name, if known, shall be given in the petition, is arrested or imprisoned in any place within the county as a fugitive slave, by any person, whose name, if known, shall be given, which petition shall be verified by the oath of the petitioner, it shall thereupon be the duty of the clerk or justice to issue a writ of *habeas corpus* in favour of the person claimed as a fugitive slave, under the seal of the Supreme Judicial Court, or the seal of the said justice in the same form and manner, as nearly as may be, as is directed in the 111th chapter of the Revised Statutes, and said writ shall be returnable forthwith to the Supreme Judicial Court, if in session, in the county in which the person claimed as a fugitive slave may be when the writ is issued, and if not so in session, before any justice of the said court.

Sec. 3. It shall be the duty of all judicial and executive officers in this commonwealth in their respective counties, who shall know or have good reason to believe that any person in the commonwealth is about to be arrested as a fugitive, forthwith to give notice thereof to some commissioner of the county in which the said person resides or may be found.

Sec. 4. If, when the hearing before any judge in vacation of any writ of *habeas corpus*, issued in favour of any person claimed as a fugitive slave, he shall not be discharged by the judge, he may appeal from such decision, and claim a trial by jury, which shall be had at the next term of the court in the same county, or at any adjournal session of said court before the next term; and the person so claimed as a fugitive may give bail to the claimant for his appearance in such sum as the judge shall deem sufficient, not exceeding one thousand dollars, with one or more securities to the satisfaction of the judge; and in default of such bail, he shall be committed to the common jail to await the trial.

Sec. 6. The court to which such appeal is taken, and any court to which a writ of *habeas corpus* is returnable, in any case under this act, may be, and shall, on application of either party, grant a trial by jury on all questions of fact in issue between the parties.

Sec. 7. The commissioners shall defray all expenses of witnesses, clerks' fees, officers' fees, and their expenses, which may be incurred in the protection and defence of any person arrested as a fugitive slave; and the same, together with the reasonable charges of the commissioner, for his services as attorney and counsel in the case, shall be paid by the State Treasurer, on a warrant to be issued by the Governor.

We have on hand several Communications from correspondents, which we are compelled to defer till next week, for want of room. Among them, we have an interesting letter from our Boston Correspondent, and another from a friend at Rochester, giving an account of the recent formation of an Anti-Slavery Society, by a few persons in that city, which notwithstanding its interest and importance must lay over another week.

Hon. J. Letcher, M. C, will accept our thanks for some public documents under his frank. We are also indebted to Hon. S. P. Chase and Hon. J. Dickey, for similar favours.

The Annual Meeting.—It will be perceived by the official notice in another column, that the place of meeting for the Annual Meeting in May, is changed from Syracuse to Rochester.

The Case of Horace Preston will be found fully reported in another column. We copy the report of the *Tribune* as fuller and more reliable than that of any other of the daily papers.

REPLY TO DR. PEABODY.

BY WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH....NO. II.

THE ALLEVIATIONS OF SLAVERY.

"I'm sure she's welcome," said Mevie, leaning her head languidly on her hand. "I think she'll find one thing, if she does, and that is, that it is we mistresses that are the slaves, down here." "O, certainly, she will discover that, and a world of wholesome truths besides," said St. Clare.—*Uncle Tom's Cabin.*

Dr. P. next attempts to show that the slaves have been very greatly benefitted by being held in Slavery—much more benefitted than they would have been if they had remained in Africa, or even been free on our shores.

It can scarcely be doubted that the blacks, on the whole, have been benefitted by their position. We do not mean by this that their condition might not have been more favourable than it has been; and, least of all, do we say it by way of apology for Slavery. But it shows that there is an overruling Providence which educes good from evil, which makes evil correct or consume itself, and forbids it to be eternal; and, in doing this, makes us more patient with those social imperfections whose remedy is beyond our control.

The slaves of the South are, comparatively, not only a civilized people, but we doubt if, in the whole history of mankind, a single example can be adduced of a race of men starting from such a depth of moral degradation and barbarism, and in a century and a half making so vast an advance in civilization. This progress has been owing, as we believe, in no small part to the fact of their being slaves. Through this relation they have been brought into close contact with a superior race under circumstances of restraint and excitement which have compelled them to abstain from some of the most debasing vices, to form habits of industry, and which have led them to catch rapidly the social, moral and religious ideas of their masters. This does not extenuate the moral wrong of Slavery, for it originated in no such philanthropic purpose. It is a fact, however, not to be overlooked (p. 6).

It will be soon enough, we think, to elaborate reasons for being patient with social evils when we find the community really impatient at their existence, and in the slightest danger of doing wrong in consequence of such impatience. But so long as the great majority of the community has yet to be aroused to a real desire to do anything to relieve themselves from Slavery, we think Dr. P.'s argument worse than useless. It is undoubtedly true that the law of God, out of evil, still educes good, but *only* by means of *man's* agency. As the God of Battles invariably decides in favour of the right of the strongest battalion, or the justice of that cause which is supported by the most skilfully commanded army, so the same Providence only destroys or mitigates those social evils against which man's efforts are directed. Any other notion of Providence than this leads to fatalism. Instead, therefore, of telling us to be patient with social evils, such as Slavery, Intemperance, because God is working to remove them, the only true way is to teach us that God never works for their removal except through our own efforts, and that no evil will ever be removed unless by our exertion, and that each man must see to it that he does not bury in the earth the talent committed to him.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that any two races of men could co-exist in one society, for two centuries, without very materially affecting each other for better or worse. Dr. P. thinks that "the heaviest part of the penalty of Slavery has fallen on the whites," and it is always worse to do wrong than to suffer wrong. But he has high authority for the opinion. Bishop Meade, of Virginia, teaches the slaves that God made them slaves because he knew that condition would be best for them in this world, and help them towards heaven better than a state of freedom. Thus he says to them:

"You may perhaps fancy that, if you had riches and freedom, you could do your duty to God and man with greater pleasure than you can now. But, pray, consider that, if you can but save your souls through the mercy of God, you will have spent your time to the best of purposes in this world; and he that at last can get to heaven has performed a noble journey, let the road be ever so rugged and difficult. Besides, you really have a great advantage over most white people, who have not only the care of their daily labour upon their hands, but the care of looking forward and providing necessaries for to-morrow and next day, and of clothing and bring up their children, and of getting food and raiment for as many of you as belong to their families, which often puts them to great difficulties, and distracts their minds so as to break their rest, and take off their thoughts from the affairs of another world. Whereas you are quite eased from all these cares, and have nothing but your daily labour to look after, and, when that is done, take your needful rest. Neither is it necessary for you to think of laying up any thing against old age, as white people are obliged to do; for the laws of the country have provided that you shall not be turned off when you are past labour, but shall be maintained, while you live, by those you belong to, whether you are able to work or not. *And these are great and real advantages, for which, if you consider things rightly, you cannot but thank Almighty God, who hath so wisely provided for your well-being here and your eternal happiness hereafter.*"

Though it is unquestionably true, as Dr. P. thinks, that there is not one moral or social interest of the whites which does not feel the disastrous influence of Slavery; still, who can doubt, after reading this testimony of Bishop Meade, "that the *heaviest* part of the penalty has fallen on the masters." True, the slave really clothes, feeds and shelters both himself and his master, but then he has no care on his own account! not he! The master must attend to all these things! To be sure, the slave is obliged to work long and hard enough to produce these results, by the "circumstances of excitement" by which he is surroundsd, but then the creation of this excitement is only another of the cares of the master! He it is who superintends the application of the cowhide, the paddle and the treadmill, in order duly to excite the "unelastic labour," as Dr. P. styles it, with which he is surrounded.

While such have been the melancholy effects of Slavery on the whites, Dr. P. thinks that "it can scarcely be doubted that the blacks, on the whole, have been benefitted by their position." By means of it, "they have been brought in contact with a superior race, under circumstances which have compelled them to abstain from some of the most debasing vices, to form habits of industry, and which have led them to catch rapidly the social, moral and religious ideas of their masters."

These are very extraordinary statements. Our investigations had led us to very different conclusions as to the condition of the slaves.

Do the slaves abstain from some of the most debasing vices?

We know no authority on this point which stands deservedly higher than that of Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, who has devoted the better portion of his life to what is called, singularly enough, the religious instruction of the slaves. No man has had wider opportunities to find out the real condition of the slaves, and we do not believe that any one has used his opportunities more faithfully. What does he say? Have "the circumstances of restraint and excitement" by which they have been surrounded compelled the slaves to abandon any of the most debasing vices? He thus describes the moral character of those of the slaves who are professed Christians:

"The discipline of coloured members is involved, tedious, vexatious, and *disgusting*" (Religious Instruction of Negroes, 1842, p. 131). "*Excommunications and suspensions are of perpetual occurrence, for crimes shocking in character*, and of themselves sufficient to show the general state of morals; *such, for example, as adultery, fornication, theft, lying, drunkenness, quarrelling, and fighting.* The first three are their most common vices" Page 135: "They are, proverbially, *thieves.* They bear this character in Africa; they have borne it in all countries whither they have been carried; it has been the character of slaves in all ages, whatever their nation or colour. They steal from each other, from their masters, from anybody..... Their veracity is nominal." Page 136: "The number, the variety, and ingenuity of falsehoods that can be told by them in a few brief moments is most astonishing..... Servants, however, who will neither steal nor lie, may be found, and in no inconsiderable numbers."

Now we know no vices more debasing to any community than adultery and fornication; and if these and other crimes are of "*perpetual* occurrence" among *professed Christians*, it cannot be true, as Dr. P. asserts, that the slaves generally have been compelled to abstain from some of the most debasing vices. On the contrary, the fact is notorious that the most debasing vices are constantly practised by the slaves amon themselves, and by the masters with the slaves.

Are the slaves led to form habits of industry?

The bare statement of this question shows its utter absurdity. There is not one argument which is more constantly brought against emancipation than this, that the slaves will not work, unless they are urged on by the "beneficent whip," as Mr. Carlyle phrases it, or by the excitements of Slavery, as Dr. P. even yet more happily phrases the cowhide, the paddle, and the tread-mill. Habits of Industry! It there be any condition in life which more than any other is firmly associated in the minds of all with ideas of idleness, it is that of Slavery—and rightly so—for Slavery deprives a man of every motive to industry. The life of a slave is one continued struggle to work as little for his master as he possibly can, and yet avoid punishment; and this is the state which Dr. P. thinks has taught habits of industry to 3,000,000 men, who would otherwise have been lazy.

Do the slaves catch rapidly the social, moral and religious ideas of their masters?

The Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia (First An. Rep. Jan. 15, 1851, p. 20, a document which Dr. P. seems pretty faithfully to have copied even in its mistakes), assert that the slaves have made great progress in civilization since the time of the revolution, "and especially have seen much and learned much concerning republican government." Doubtless the house servants have caught, in some degree, the social ideas of their masters. At any rate, it is a fact that runaway slaves are chiefly house servants or mechanics. But it is simply preposterous to suppose that the slaves, taken as a body, know anything whatever about the form, or principles of government, or social institutions under which they live, other than that the laws regard them as slaves, and deprive them of very nearly every personal right, and closely bar up every avenue to knowledge.

If it be true that the slaves have caught rapidly the moral ideas of their masters, we can only say, may God help the masters, if their immorality is as great as that of the slaves!

We are rejoiced at the fact that not quite one-tenth of the slaves have been brought under religious influence; for the systematic wickedness which is practised on the slaves, under the pretence of giving them religious instruction, is a disgrace to the Christianity of the land. The following is a summary of the quality of the religious instruction imparted to slaves, by their masters, and by Christian Bishops and Clergymen of all denominations:

To escape everlasting torments in hell, a slave must submit to remain in Slavery! He must neither murmur nor repine at his lot, but rather give thanks to God for his loving-kindness and tender mercy in removing from his path so many temptations to sin! He must obey his master in all things, and do the work assigned to him faithfully and diligently, "in singleness of heart, as unto Christ"! He must act honestly, and never waste any of "the comforts and conveniences of life" which he procures for his master. No accumulation of injuries or deprivations can excuse him for running away; but he is bound to endure all his wrongs with cheerfulness and patience, and, leaving his cause in the hands of God, look to Heaven alone for his reward (Slavery and the Constitution, p. 64–65)!

Dr Jones candidly tells the masters, "the religious instruction of your people will promote *your own interests* for time and eternity" (Relig. Instruc. p 285) If Dr. Peabody thinks that the teaching of such an truths has benefitted the slaves, we can only say we differ from him. We do not believe that even slaves can progress in civilization by being taught to believe that God has made them slaves, and requires them to labour on patiently, and never run away. So far from improving a man, and making him more fit to enjoy freedom, such teaching must either make him a consummate hypocrite or only so much the fitter to be a slave. In either case, there is no progress in civilization.

But nine-tenths of the slaves have not adopted these religious ideas of the masters. Dr. Fuller, at the Annual Meeting of the American Colonisation

does, will, by some strange process, gradually cultivate a respect for the marriage relation, a sacred regard for the family ties, and an earnest desire for the benefits of education! We confess our inability to draw such conclusions from such premises, but we never had much taste for logic.

But it is by no means the fact, that the slaves generally are as far advanced in civilization as the colonists of Liberia. More than one-third of all the blacks sent to Liberia by the American Colonization Society and the United States Government were born in this country free, and of course had much superior advantages and opportunities for acquiring knowledge than slaves can have. In Liberia there are said to be "more than 2,000 communicants in Christian churches, and more than fifteen hundred children in Sabbath schools; some 40 day schools, containing, exclusive of the Methodists, who are the most numerous, and of whose numbers in school we have no report, about 635 scholars. The whole number in day schools, therefore, is probably not less than 1200." (1st An. Rep. Trus. of Donations, p. 14.) There are also 2 high schools in Monrovia, and 1 at Cape Palmas, one manual labour school and one female academy at Millsburg, and one Baptist boarding school at Bexley. It would be strange if, with such advantages, and the enjoyment of freedom for so long a time, the colonists were *not* very greatly in advance of our slaves, to whom the advantages of freedom and education are wholly denied. It is therefore absurd in Dr. P. to argue that our slaves are inferior to the native Africans, because the colonists of Liberia are.

Besides, this difficulty, the native Africans, even those descended from the same stock as our slaves, are entirely different from what they would have been, if Slavery and the slave trade had not existed for three centuries. Dr. P. has no right to say that servitude has civilised the negro in this country, to a greater extent than they could have been civilized in Africa, simply because Slavery has injured them less here than those in Africa. The only just comparison for Dr. P. to make is between what the native African was before the power of the slave trade had struck a deadly blow at civilization in Africa, and what the American slave is now. We utterly deny that such a comparison will result unfavourably to the native Africans. By carrying on the slave trade for three centuries, we have done all in our power to demoralize Africa, and utterly prevent all chance for education or advance in civilization, and it is unutterably base for us now to seek to palliate our wickedness in supporting Slavery here by asserting that our slaves, notwithstanding all their wrongs, are yet more advanced than the native Africans are. If the fact were so, it would only prove that we had wronged the native Africans more than our slaves—not by any means that our slaves are more civilized than they would have been if the African slave trade had never been carried on.

We do not, however, believe Dr. P.'s description of the native African to be true—even of the Africans of to-day—and certainly not of those with whom alone we can rightly compare our slaves. The missionary Oldendorp (1777) says, "there is scarcely any nation of Guinea which does not believe in the immortality of the soul, and that it continues to live after its separation from the body, has certain necessities, performs actions, and is especially capable of the enjoyment of happiness or misery. The negroes believe almost universally that the souls of good men, after their separation from the body, go to God, and the wicked to the evil spirit, whence, at the death of their chiefs, they make use of the expression, God has taken their souls." The same missionary assures us that he recognised among the negroes a universal belief in the "existence of a God," whom they represent as very powerful and beneficent. "He is the maker of the world and of men, he it is who thunders in the air, as he punishes the wicked with his bolts. He regards beneficent actions with complacency, and rewards them with long life. To him the negroes ascribe their own personal gifts, the fruits of the earth, and all good things. From him the rain descends upon the earth. They believe that he is pleased when men offer prayer to him in all their wants and that he succours them in danger, in disease and in season of drought. This is the chief God, who lives far from them on high; he is supreme over all the other Gods."

"Among all the black nations, (continues Oldendorp) with whom I have become acquainted, even among the utterly ignorant and rude, there is none which did not believe in a God, which had not learnt to give him a name, which did not regard him as the maker of the world, and ascribe to him more or less clearly all the attributes which I have here briefly summed up. Besides this supreme and beneficent Diety, whom all the various nations worship in some way or other, they believe in many gods of inferior dignity, who are subject to the chief deity, and are mediators between him and mankind."

"The negroes profess their dependence upon the Deity in different ways, especially by prayer and offerings." Oldendorp gives specimens of some of these prayers. Thus the daily prayer of one negress was "O! God, I know thee not, but thou knowest me, thy assistance is necessary to me." At meals, they say, "O! God, thou has given me this, thou hast made it grow." And when they work, "O! God, thou hast caused that I should have strength to do this." The morning prayer of others is, "O! God help us, we do not know whether we shall live to-morrow; we are in thy hand." Some pray for their deceased friends. Father Godfrey Loyer gives other additional proof. But "it is evident, from the foregoing statements, that the negroes of Africa exhibit, in their original and primitive state of mind, untaught by foreign instructors, at least within the range of history, the same internal principles, in common with the rest of the human family" (A Tribute for the Negro, 74-77.) If, therefore, the native African of to-day, instead of bowing before a parchment as we do, bows before a stone, offers human sacrifices, and scarcely has a notion of right and wrong—which we do not believe to be true—such is not by any means a true description of the original character of the African—that African with whom alone we can rightly compare our slave, in order to test the question whether Slavery has been a benefit or an injury.

Nor is it true that the native Africans are without arts or industry. "The industry of the Foulahs," says Mungo Park, "in agriculture and pasturage is every where remarkable." The inhabitants of the interior, those who have been less subject to the disastrous influences of the slave trade, are more civilized and virtuous than those on the coast. They surpass them also in the preparation of wool, leather, cotton, wood and metal, in weaving, dying and sewing. "It is known to all who have visited Liberia, that large substantial cotton cloths, spun and dyed by the natives of interior Africa, are brought in great numbers, for sale, to the merchants of Monrovia and the neighbouring settlements, and are purchased by the Africans on the coast." (N. N. Gurley's Report to the Hon J. M. Clayton, Ex. Doc. No. 75, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 32). Thomas Clarkson thus describe some articles of African manufacture which he exhibited to the Emperor of Russia in 1818: "We examined the articles in leather first, one by one, with which he was uncommonly gratified. He said they exhibited not only genius, but taste, and that he had never seen neater work either in Petersburg or in London. There was one piece of cotton cloth which attracted his particular notice, and which was undoubtedly very beautiful. It called from him this observation—Manchester, says he, I think, is your great place for manufactures of this sort; do you think they can make a better piece of cotton there? I told him I thought I had never seen a better piece of workmanship of the kind anywhere. Having gone over all the articles, the Emperor desired me to inform him, whether he was to understand that these articles were made by the *Africans in their own country*, that is in their own native village, *or after they had arrived in America*, where they would have an opportunity of seeing European manufactures, and experienced workmen in the arts? I replied, that such articles might be found *in every African village, both on the coast and in the interior*, and that they were samples of their own ingenuity, without any connection with Europeans.

Buxton, in his "Essay on Colonisation," says, that "on a question put to me in the British House of Commons, I offered to produce specimens of their manufacture, in iron, gold, filagree work, leather, cotton, matting, and basket work; some of which equal any articles of the kind fabricated in Europe, and evince that, with proper encouragement, they would make excellent workmen." (Deb. in p 140-42.)

Similar proofs of the existence of industry and arts among the native Africans might be multiplied, but these are sufficient to utterly overthrow Dr. P.'s unsupported assertion that they are destitute of both.

Dr. P.'s theory, then, that Slavery has civilized and educated the negroes more than they would have been if they had remained in Africa, is a mere theory, wholly unsupported by any facts, and contradicted by many. He has the credit of defending the same theory as that maintained by Bishop Meade and a host of other Southern clergymen who preach the divine character of slaveholding. He says, he has no idea of being regarded as an apologist for Slavery, but he places himself by the side of the very strongest of them.

Communications.

CONVENTION AT WALWORTH.

WALWORTH, March 28 1852.

DEAR FRIEND GAY: We have just been favoured with a very interesting Anti-Slavery Convention, held by Stephen S. and Abby K. Foster, Sally Holly, and Giles Stebbins; all are choice spirits in the cause of reform; men and women of noble and heroic mind. Such was the pro-slavery feeling in the Churches of this place that we were unable to get a notice of the convention read in them. Notwithstanding this, the meeting was well attended. The people thirsting after truth, in spite of pro-slavery priests, filled the house. S. S. Foster wielded the mighty lever of truth against the pro-slavery parties, Churches, and priests of the present day, in a powerful and affecting manner, without fear, confident of success in the holy cause in which he is engaged.

Sally Holly presented the condition of three millions of our fellow countrymen in a deep and impressive manner. While she spoke of the opposition which truth in every age has met, and of the persecutions of the true followers of Christ, her eloquence reached the hardest hearts. All alike felt the magic power of truth as it fell from her lips.

The convention was one of deep interest to all who attended. Oh! would that the Anti-Slavery Society could send out scores of others, as efficient labourers to speed the cause of reform. My earnest prayer is that the time may soon come, when our churches throughout the land may be thrown open to welcome those who plead the cause of down-trodden humanity. When that eventful time shall come, the chains may be heard falling from the bleeding limbs of the slave. At the close of the convention, S. S. Foster offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That we have no confidence in political organizations for the overthrow of Slavery, but believe the best of them to be worse than useless in carrying forward this great and glorious cause.

Yours for the cause of humanity, A. J. SIMMONS.

CONVENTION AT WILLIAMSON.

WILLIAMSON, 3 mo., 28 1852.

S. H. GAY—ESTEEMED FRIEND: I herewith enclose the proceedings of the Anti-Slavery Convention, held at this place, for publication in the *Standard*. The Convention was well attended, not withstanding the influence of the three popular Churches to prevent the people from going. These three Churches are now united, and in full blast in carrying on what they call religion. The Wesleyans came out from the M. E. Church, professedly on account of its pro-slavery character, and have steadily, and constantly denounced them for building up the slave system. They *now* compromise their principles (if they ever had any), by uniting with pro-slavery Churches to convert souls, to what: to a pro-slavery sectarian religion. They did, as a *special favour*, read the notice for the Convention, in their meeting, and then desired, or, in other words, prohibited, "all praying souls" from attending it. Such is the character of all such religion—it abounds in faith, but works are left for those, whom they denounced as Infidels. Thine for the slave,

G. M. COOPER.

At an Anti-Slavery Convention held in Williamson, at the meeting-house formerly occupied by the Society of Friends, on the 22d and 23d of March, 1852, Daniel Underwood was elected President, G. M. Cooper and Sarah Smith Vice Presidents, and Howell Reeves Secretary.

The position of the American Church and Clergy was ably and eloquently argued and discussed by Stephen S. and Abby Kelly Foster in its practical bearings and effects upon the system of American Slavery, clearly elucidating and proving the fact, that the church is mainly responsible for the continuance of this most atrocious and abhorrent system; that the sin of Slavery lies at the door of the church, because it is acknowleged by the most influential and responsible part of the clergy, that they have the power to do it away. The position was also assumed, that the most effective Law in this country, is public opinion, and that the renovation of public sentiment is essentially requisite to the Emancipation of the Slave; and that the best means of accomplishing this work, is the faithful preaching of the truth, and not by the action of political parties; the discussion on this question became animated and interesting; exceptions being taken by James Gregg, and Samuel C. Cuyler, on the part pertaining to political action; they maintaining that it is necessary to carry the question to the ballot box; yet the affirmative of the question was carried by the meeting.

The following Resolutions were Introduced and adopted:

Resolved, That the Wesleyan minister and church at this place, by closing their house against this Convention, and at the same time inviting clergymen who legalize Slavery, and hold religious fellowship with slave-holders, to assist them in carrying on a revival of Religion, have given the most conclusive evidence that they are not the friends of the slave; that their Religion is mere sectarianism, and not Christianity, and that their influence is no less pernicious to the cause of freedom than that of the old church from which they came out; also

Resolved, That a sectarian Religion will always, in the trying hour, prove untrue to Liberty.

The attendance of the meeting, was increasingly large, considering the circumstances of the time and place, being under the necessity of holding it about one mile out of the village, in consequence of the meeting houses at the village being closed against it; the Wesleyan Methodist having united with the Presbyterian and Baptist, in carrying on a protracted meeting, and for that purpose had agreed to eschew the subject of Slavery, notwithstanding they claimed to be the special advocates and representatives of the slave; in consequence of which, the foregoing Resolutions were brought to bear against them.

The meeting was concluded in the most orderly manner, and was characterized throughout by a sensation of deep interest and feeling in behalf of the slave, and finally closed with the most fraternal feelings of friendship and brotherly love.

H. Reeves, Sec, D. UNDERWOOD, President.

——It is computed that there were 7,984,957 persons carried on railroads in the United States, last year, and about 86 killed and 47 injured. Most of the killed were employees of the companies. There were 11,967 persons carried for every mile of line.

——FOR MECHANICAL PURPOSES.—A man in Maine applied for two gallons of rum for "mechanical purposes." "For what mechanical purposes," asked the agent. "For raising a barn," was the reply.—*Prov. Journal.*

——THE Governor of Mass., with the advice of Council, has appointed Thursday, the 8th of April next, to be observed as a day of Public Fasting and Prayer.

Miscellaneous Items.

CASE OF HORACE PRESTON.

FIRST DAY...Thursday, April 1st.

A complaint was lately made in the U. S. Commissioner's office, before Judge Morton, charging that Horace Preston, a person held to service or labour in the State of Maryland, did, on or about 20th March, 1847, escape into another State, and is now in New York, as a fugitive from such labour of service, &c.

A certificate was made by Richard Busteed, acting for William Reese, of Baltimore, Maryland, claimant of Preston, alleging that there is considerable excitement, and saking, the aid of the U. S. Marshal to have him removed to the State of Maryland.

It was said that Preston had acknowledged at the Second Ward Police to Mr. Reese, that he had been held to labour, in other words a slave of Mr. R. and left there about five years ago.

E. D. Culver, Esq., appeared on behalf of the accused, assisted by Mr. John Jay, before the Commissioners, and Mr. R. Busteed for claimant

Preston is a strong-built, hearty-appearing, black man, about 26 or 28 years of age.

William D. Reese, who came to New York as agent for the alleged owner, was sworn—I reside in Baltimore, Md., know William Reese, the claimant; he is my father; know Horace Preston, now present; I have known him 11 years before he left Baltimore; he left there five years ago; he was a slave there; and the property of William Reese, the claimant; I had known him as such slave for 18 years; he and I lived together in the same house for 13 years, and worked at the same business, brick-making, in the same yard; he was a slave when he left Baltimore, and the property of Mr. Reese.

By Mr. Culver—The way I identify him this morning is from the fact of having known him in Baltimore; do not know him from any mark except that his upper jaw teeth in front are wide apart; I have conversed with him this morning; I spoke to him in the Second Ward Station House. (Objected to by Mr. Culver, as the party was in duress, but allowed). I said, "Horace, do you know me?" he said, "Yes, Sir, I know you;" I asked him what is my name; he replied, your name is William Reese; I said, you have seen me before, have you, Horace? he said, I suppose I have, when I was raised with you; he spoke of the time when he left Baltimore; he said he left Saturday night late; we thought he had left on Sunday morning; this was the first time Preston had seen me since he left Baltimore.

[The Deputy Marshal brought to the Commissioner a paper to sign. Mr. Culver objected to the Commissioner signing a paper in the case while the cross-examination was proceeding. The Commissioner as much as said the paper he had signed was not a paper in the case. Mr. Busteed appeared to be exceedingly anxious to hurry the proceedings, and considerable altercation took place between him and Mr. Culver. Mr. C. stated that the original warrant in the case was defective, and he would hold responsible all that were engaged in it).

Witness continued—There were, at the Station House, when I went this morning, Mr. Martin, an officer, whom we call watchman. (Mr. Busteed objected to the witness saying Mr. M. was an officer, and the Commissioner said the witness must state only what he knew). Mr. Busteed, my counsel, was also there, and a man named Joe; you must find out his other name; I do not know; I first heard of Horace being at the Station House from Mr. Busteed; I went there about 9 o'clock; I arrived in the City yesterday evening about 7 o'clock.

I received information about two years ago that Horace was in New York; I do not know who sent the last information to Baltimore about Horace; I am 31 years of age; Horace is about three years my junior; my father resides in Baltimore; he is 51 years of age; he has three other slaves, the mother of Horace and his two sisters; they now live in the family; the mother is neither very light nor very dark; she is a little lighter than Horace; I don't know whether she was ever married or not; I know she had a husband; I have seen him often.

I am not prepared to say whether he is now living or dead; he disappeared some four or five years ago; he did not belong to my father, but worked about; when he conducted himself properly toward his wife my father allowed him to stay, but when he misconducted himself my father lambasted him and drove him away; I know him to be a slave from the (fact that my father married his owner, or mistress. Objected to). The only way I know that he was the slave of my step-mother is that he was always about the house, and heard that he was such, and heard him call her mistress.

I don't know of my own knowledge that my step-mother ever bought him; do not know what ownership she exercised over him previous to her marriage with my father; I was too young; have no knowledge that she owned him, except hearing her say she owned him as a slave; never saw Horace before she married my father; the marriage, I believe was in 1831 or 1832; I never saw any bill of sale of him; I don't know that my step-mother ever transferred him over to my father. (Mr. Culver said in the event of the wife being the owner, the application must be made in her behalf).

My father told me on Tuesday that he heard Horace was in New York, and he wished me to go on and identify him; he said an officer had sent him word; did not state his name.

The witness was asked if he knew the officer by whom the man was arrested. It was objected to. Mr. Culver wished to show that there had been an arrangement to pay $150 in the event of the party being the same, which had been doubted. Mr. Jay insisted upon the right of claimant to have regular proof under 6th section of Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, which he read. Opposition was made by Mr. Busteed.

Witness continued.—The officer's name is James Martin; don't know whether my father received a telegraphic message; he merely told me he had received information that Horace was here; I think he received notice by telegraph; he met me in the stable, said he had received a dispatch, and asked me to go or; do not know what Martin communicated to him or what was his previous communication; do not know that there was any arrangement between Martin and my father in regard to catching Horace; my step-mother did not live more than five or six years after her marriage; do not know whether she ever made a will; at the time of my step-mother's marriage she owned another, a yellow man named Smith; I was about 11 years of age when my father was married; I am not in business with my father, nor has he divided off any property to his children; my mother lived in Cambridge before she married my father; never heard that Horace was kidnapped and sold to my step-mother; understood in 1847 that he was kidnapped and carried off, but Horace himself told me this morning that he walked off himself; my father gave me no direction to settle or pay Martin in case the claim was established; he gave me no funds in relation to the object; think Horace's two sisters were born after my father's marriage.

Q.—Do you know that your father did not send him to another State on business?

A.—I do. My father told me he had run away, and took with him a suit of clothes worth $40; suppose he walked away; I was married, and was not living with my father at that time.

Q.—Do you know how he went away, aside from what has been told you?

A.—I know that he and Dick were sent to work, and on Sunday morning they were absent, and the Monday following, and my father said Dick and Horace had run away; from the fact of their being absent, I knew that they had run away; can swear to my own knowledge, that I believe my father never sent him out of the State.

Q.—Do you know whether his mother was ever permitted to go out of the State?

[Objected to. Mr. C., said if the woman had been sent out of the State, it made her a free woman, and her child free.]

A.—As far back as my memory goes, I can swear his mother never was sent out of the State. I do not know that at the time of my father marrying my step-mother, that she had any landed estate or other property. My father was then a brick-maker of 40 years standing; do not remember how many children Horace's mother had; believe some of them died.

By Mr. Busteed—Do not know what property my step-mother possessed when my father married her. After she came into the house she brought in these slaves, and I understand she owned them.

By Mr. Culver—Do not know the mode in which they came; I was too young to know; do not know who claimed them before that time.

By Mr. Busteed—Horace never left the State of Maryland, as I can say of my own knowledge from the time I first knew him till he ran away in 1847, worked with him, for the two years previous to 1847, nine hours a day, face to face; I worked as hard as he did, and harder.

By Mr. Culver—Was paid for my work; never worked for any man without being paid for it; worked before I was 21 without pay; Horace was treated as well as I was; after he was done his day's work he was paid extra, and could make $2 or $3 a week; cannot say to my own knowledge that Horace never went out of the State; I was absent to Boston 13 days in 1845.

Mr. Busteed said that the witness might leave the stand. That is their case.

Mr. Culver wished to recall the witness as to the affidavits on which the warrant was issued. He insisted that the affidavits of Mr. Busteed and Mr. Reese are defective, in not stating that Horace was held to bondage by virtue of the laws of the State of Maryland.

The Commissioner thought that the cross examination had been closed. Mr. Busteed vigorously contended as to the same, talked of fanatics, &c.

Mr. Culver stated that it was by accident he found out this morning where the man was, and he had looked around for an hour without being able to find him, and he at last found him before the Commissioner in this room behind a wood pile, with the witness sworn; and the Commissioner refused him time to confer with other counsel. Mr. Busteed replied, saying his sympathies were strongly in favour of freedom, but he was in favour of carrying out the law, &c.

The Commissioner finally decided that he would permit the witness to be recalled, so as to have the case fully investigated.

The witness was recalled and questions asked him as to the power of attorney, but objected to by Mr. Busteed.

Mr. Jay said it would be no doubt pleasant to Mr. Busteed to ship the man off by the 5 o'clock train. Mr. Busteed said he did not want to do that.

The witness was shown the power of attorney. It was delivered to Mr. B. yesterday.

Q.—What did Mr. Busteed do under the power of attorney? (Objected to).

The witness stated that he saw Martin as he was coming up from the boat; did not tell me Horace was arrested; went to Mr. Busteed's house about 11 o'clock and woke him up; asked him where Horace was; he said he did not know. (Questions, as to whether Mr. B. told witness to go to the Station House, &c., were objected to). Saw H. this morning at the Second Ward Station House; there may have been some arrangement between my father and Martin as to what the latter is to get, but I do not know what it is; do not know whether Horace was arrested on some other charge, or if he was arrested on this warrant while he was already under arrest; think Mr Busteed knew of Horace being a fugitive before I handed him the power of attorney; I told him so myself in this City a week or two ago; do not think he knew of his arrest when I spoke to him last night.

The questions were objected to by Mr. Busteed, and the Commissioner said to the witness that he might answer the questions or not, as he (the Commissioner) thought the questions had already been asked, &c.

Q.—Have you seen Martin to-day?

Witness—Mum is the word.

Mr. Jay said he insisted upon the witness answering.

The witness got up on the Marshal's stand and sat with his back against the wall. Mr. Jay suggested to the Commissioner that he had better give the witness a newspaper (a laugh).

It was understood that the witness, by assent of the Commissioner, refused to answer any more questions.

Mr. Culver suggested that as it had become late in the afternoon, that an adjournment should be allowed until to-morrow. The Commissioner said he was ready to sit till 10 o'clock at night, and if counsel had any witnesses to produce, they could do so. Mr. C., said that there were some points of law he would like to urge, but he thought as it was past the usual time of adjournment, and they had had nothing to eat, that an adjournment should be allowed. It was with the greatest difficulty I found out, this morning, where the man was, and from appearance I have reason to believe it was not intended the examination should be made public at all. Mr C. thought it was a matter of right there should be an adjournment.

The Commissioner finally decided to adjourn till this forenoon.

On the adjournment, Preston's wife, who had been sitting in one corner of the room during the examination, in much grief, approached to where he sat, kneeled down in front of him and gave way to her lamentation.

Mr. Busteed, on something being said, remarked that he would try the liberal spirit of Mr. Jay, and give $25 if Mr J. would give $50 toward liberating the man, saying, "come now," and slapping his hand down on the table; Mr. J. made some reply; Mr. Culver said that Mr. B. was a very generous man in sound; "I think," said Mr. C., "it is wind, myself; do the dirty work and then turn round and make a great offer." Mr J. remarked to Mr. B as the latter was going out, "they have got hold of the right counsel this time"

SECOND DAY.....Tuesday, April 2.

JOHN JAY, ESQ., ASSAULTED BY THE CLAIMANT'S COUNSEL—KNOCK DOWN ANSWERS FROM A WITNESS—APOLOGIES, &c.

The case of Horace Preston, claimed by Mr. Reese, of Maryland, as owing to said R. service and labour, &c., was continued, Mr. Culver being engaged in another case, Mr R S. Emmet appeared as counsel for accused, in connection with Mr. Jay, in his place. Mr. Bowlen appeared with Mr. Busteed.

Mr. Jay alluded to a report of Mr. Busteed having made a statement that there was excitement, &c., and desiring the aid of the Marshal. Mr. B. refused to say whether there had been such statement, and the Commissioner said he did not know of any such affidavit,

[The statement was made, and on the reporter's table, but not sworn to.]

Mr. Jay wished to examine Mr. Busteed, counsel on the other side, as to the affidavits.

R. Busteed, sworn—Is counsellor-at-law. Mr. B. was asked when he was admitted to the bar, and he thought it unimportant to answer. The affidavit shown is mine: in the affidavit the statement is made that P. owes labour in Maryland: I became acquainted with the fact that he does so precisely as I do any other fact.

Q—How long have you known Horace Preston?

A—I think my acquaintance with him began about two hours before that of Mr. Jay; if Mr. J. first saw him yesterday: my acquaintance was two hours before; don't know whether I ever saw him before yesterday; how that agrees with my having known him two hours before you (Mr. J.) did not find out by your legal acumen; don't know when to the best of my knowledge and belief I first saw Preston.

[Mr. J. asked the Commissioner to request the witness to answer directly.]

Know Mr. Reese of Baltimore; don't know when I last saw him; think I have not seen him in April; saw him last month in a host of places; as my house for one place; don't know when Mr. Reese became entitled to the service of Horace Preston; I believe about twenty years ago; know the fact as I know any other fact; I did not know Mr. Reese or Preston at that time; I was rather juvenile then; can't tell exactly when I became acquainted with the relationship between Mr. Reese and Preston; you have it before you in that affidavit; Mr. Reese has a great many relatives in this city, and I have conversed with them as to what Mr. R. did in Baltimore; will not give their names; I know their names.

[Mr. Jay requested the Commissioner to require the witness to answer. The Commissioner said he wished the witness to answer. Mr. J. said the Commissioner was sitting as a Court and could compel it. The Commissioner said he wished he was a Court.]

Mr. B. said if the Commissioner considered the names relevant he would answer it.

[Mr. J. requested subpœnas for Mr. Martin the police officer who originally arrested Preston, and for an officer to serve it, as they have not been enabled to find him. They were issued.]

Mr. Jay, in reply to Mr. Busteed, said they had reason to believe the slaves of the person owning the mother of Preston, had been manumitted, and it was proper to have a knowledge of the relatives.

The Commissioner said he could not compel the witness to answer, and he could do so or not. If he was Judge of the Court or District Court, he might have power to make a witness answer.

Mr. Jay wanted to know if this was a mere farce—that they can come here and swear to as much as they please, and then can answer or not, as they please, on a cross-examination. Mr Emmet said that taking this case merely as a police examination, there a defendant has right to the benefit of cross-examination. The affidavit of Mr. Busteed is his direct examination, and this is his cross-examination.

Mr. Busteed insisted upon his right to act on the witness-stand, in the double capacity of counsel and witness. This was objected to.

Mr. J. asked the witness if this affidavit was the one on which the arrest was made. The witness replied that the counsel had better ask the Commissioner, as he knows best.

Mr. Jay said to the Commissioner that if the witness would not answer, and the Court could not require him to do so, he would have to ask the Commissioner to testify as to the fact. The Commissioner said he would not go on the stand to testify.

Mr. Jay then rose. He held the affidavit of Mr B in his hand, and said they had reason to believe there was rank perjury in regard to it.

Mr. B., who was on the witness-stand, near the counsel's table said if the gentleman was out of this room, he would not say that. Almost while he was speaking, Mr. B. advanced a step toward Mr. Jay, and struck the latter a violent blow on the face.

The Commissioner left the room. In a short time afterward, Judge Betts came in. He went to the Commissioner's bench, said he understood there had been disorder before the Commissioner. I shall take a report from him, and if I find gentlemen are to blame, I shall place in close confinement both of them. While the Commissioner is performing his functions, I shall expect perfect order in regard to him, and will place in confinement any person infringing the rules.

Messrs. Jay and Emmet each requested the Judge, if the Commissioner would assent to it, to take the case from the Commissioner, and remit it to the Court, as the Commissioner has stated he has no power to compel witnesses to answer. The Judge said he could not do that, as he had not judicial power, and would not have till next week. Judge Judson now being engaged performing the judicial duties of this district.

The Judge then left, a difficulty arising in his being able to get out of the room, as the officer locked it on his entering and the key broke. It was finally forced open.

Mr. Jay, after the difficulty, said he had spoken hastily as to the affidavit, and had not shown sufficient regard, perhaps, to the feelings of the witness, but the affidavit states freely that Preston owes service and labour to Mr. Reese, and yet the evidence is that there was no knowledge such as that which is necessary to invalidate such an affidavit.

Mr. Jay again asked the question.

Witness—I have declined to answer the question, and do decline; I think I have seen a bill of sale to Reese of Preston; I think it is from one who owned them in severalty, and it was an one executed on trial, but of that I am not certain, or of the terms of contract.

Q—Then I call upon the counsel to produce it.

A—I cannot, as I do not have it; I have seen it several times; do not recollect when; saw it in the hands of Mr. Reese, at Baltimore; do not recollect whether I was acting as his legal counsel at the time; think I saw it this year; do not know whether I read it or not; think the grantee, Mr. Reese, knew very little about it; do not know that it is under my legal contract.

Mr. Jay here said, the Marshal declines to serve the subpœna. He asked the Commissioner to direct an officer to do so. The Commissioner said he had no power to compel the presence of witnesses. He was ready to go on with the examination. All he is here for is to see if the testimony is sufficient to satisfy him.

Mr. Jay said he knew his Honour's Court was a peculiar sort of one, but he had no idea it was such a skeleton of a Court.

By Witness—Believe I saw the bill of sale in this city; refused to answer whether I received a letter from Mr. Reese before getting the power of attorney; I took no steps for the arrest of Preston before receiving the power; I do not know whether I know Officer Martin of the Sixth Ward, or not; do not know, of my own knowledge, who arrested Preston; think I heard who arrested him; do not know whether, before the arrival of the power, Preston was arrested on a charge of theft, with a view to his detention in this case; if I heard of his being arrested on any charge, it would be improper for me to answer, as I do not know of my own knowledge.

The witness was asked questions as to the point, but they were evaded as not proper questions, &c.

Mr. Jay asked the Commissioner to request witness to answer. They expected to show a conspiracy with a view to the arrest of this man, in which some of our Police officers, the guardians of our rights were concerned.

Witness—Saw Mr Reese, son of claimant, night before last, at my house; he woke me from my sleep; do not remember what passed between us.

[Mr. Jay called upon the Commissioner to require answers, but the Commissioner said nothing.]

Do not know whether Preston had been arrested at the time Mr. Reese called on me the night before last; never saw Preston in Baltimore; never been there or in Maryland; how I came to swear Preston owed service and labour to Mr. Reese I decline to say, because I think the question is asked from a bad motive; when I made the affidavit I believed it from different sources; will not say, because none but dishonest corrupt persons would suppose that I made the affidavit from improper motives.

Mr. Jay asked if it is not proper to have the facts on which the affidavit was made.

The Commissioner did not compel it.

Mr Jay asked Mr. Busteed if he had been engaged in any other case of this kind. Witness said it was none of Mr. J's. business. Mr. Jay asked if he had been counsel for a claimant in a case where a person, without having had counsel, had been hurried off as a slave, without being allowed to see his family. The commissioner replied that Mr. Busteed was not counsel in that case.

Witness was asked further as to witness's knowledge of Preston having been arrested on a pretended charge of theft. The witness refused to answer, as he did not know of his own knowledge. Saw him at Second Ward Station House; does not know of his own knowledge where he was taken to from there; next saw him in this room; think a man whose first name was Joseph was the one who told me that Preston was at the Second Ward Station House; do not recollect where I was at the time.

The witness was pressed as to his recollection. He said he now recollects, but refuses to answer as it is irrelevant.

The Commissioner was asked to notice the discrepancy. Mr. Morton said he was only here to keep order. He would not lumber up his minutes with such questions.

The witness wished to state something he said in cross-examination, but it was not allowed, as it was not asked.

Mr. Jay then moved to strike out the affidavit, and to dismiss the case, and urged also that claimant had not brought himself within the law.

The application was for the present denied. Mr. Jay made other motions for discharge.

Mr. Jay proceeded to argue that there was no evidence before the Court to show that Preston was the slave of Reese, nor has it been shown here in what manner the laws of Maryland are administered in respect to Slavery. Under the 6th section of the act it is necessary to show such, and all the requirements of that section must be proved before this man can be deprived of his liberty.

There is no evidence in this case, except the affidavit, that Preston was held to labour in Maryland, and the facts in regard to that have been shown. As to what has been said by Mr. Reese of admissions by Preston at the Station House, these admissions cannot be received, as the law will not permit a party arrested in such a case as this to testify in regard to himself. But even admitting what he said, there is nothing proven that he owed service or labour to Mr. Reese. It merely showed that he had been in Maryland and knew the witness, &c.

There is no proof that the mother of Preston was a slave, nor that Preston was. There was not the slightest apology for not producing a bill of sale if there had been one. There is no proof, either, that Preston had never been sent by Mr. Reese on business out of Maryland. If he had been, for a single hour, by his master's consent, in Pennsylvania, for instance, and afterward returned to Maryland, he was a free man; and if he left afterward, no claim could be made in regard to him.

The question is not whether he had formerly owed service, but whether Reese has a title to claim ownership in regard to him. It is said there is a bill of sale. If there is such, it should be produced, as no oral testimony can be given when the written testimony exists. How can the Commissioner decide as to that bill of sale unless it is before him? It may be a bill of sale till he is 21 years of age, or in some other way qualified.

When I spoke of the affidavit of Mr. Busteed, I simply meant to assert, as I do still, that the statements of that affidavit are incorrect. It is not possible for a person to make a positive affidavit, under the circumstances, to answer the rule.

The whole case rests on the bill of sale. They have not given us the bill of sale, a certified copy, nor its contents—and the presumption is, if it were produced it would be in favour of the freedom of Preston. And, particularly, do I say that the affidavit of Mr. Busteed should be ruled out.

There is no evidence that he owed service in the State of Maryland, that he owed it to Mr. Reese, and escaped while owing such service.

Mr. J. hoped the Commissioner would reflect upon the motion before deciding it. The Commissioner has well said, you are here placed in an omnious position. You are not only without power to compel testimony, but are clothed with power as to the rights of an individual of the most extended description. Here is the man, here, sitting, accompanied by his wife. It is for you to say whether he is to be sent to hopeless servitude. In all other cases, even to a sum as low as $20, there is right of appeal, but under this law your power is absolute. You give a certificate, and he is sent away, and no Court can interfere. The counsel contended that the complaint should be dismissed: if not that the witnesses who have been subpœnaed by the Marshal should be heard,

Mr. Busteed replied. He apologized to the Commissioner, and to Mr. Jay for having made an assault upon the latter. He said it was the first blow he had ever struck a human being in his life, and he trusted it would be the last. He struck that blow under feelings of excitement, caused by the charge which had been made, and which Mr. Jay has since said he did not mean in the sense which the language implied.

Mr. Busteed contended that possession is presumptive right to chattel property. The presumption is in this case, where it has been shown that Preston was in the service of Mr. Reese in 1847, and he being a black man, the probability is he was a slave, escaped and is found in New York. Mr. B. referred to decisions as to chattel property, as to which

Mr. Jay inquired if such decisions referred to a case of this kind.

Mr. B referred to decisions as to slaves, and also a decision in this case where a man, having the accent of an Irishman, was held to be an Irishman.

Mr. B. said, that having shown possession of Preston, that he was in our employ, to our service for years, doing and owing service which was our due, I have shown enough to entitle us to the possession of the person whom we claim as a fugitive from service.

As to a bill of sale, Mr. B. stated that they do not rely upon that, and no bill of sale has been offered in testimony. He contended that the complaint should not be dismissed.

The Commissioner said he would reserve the decision of the case till to-morrow. Mr. Jay wished to say a few words in reply to the remarks as to decisions of Mr. B.

At the close of Mr. Busteed's remarks, the Commissioner observed that he would adjourn until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock, when he would probably give a decision.

Mr. Jay asked if he could be heard in reply to Mr. Busteed at the opening of the Court.

The Commissioner said he would rather hear Mr. Jay now.

The Commissioner thought he would not like to hear argument to-morrow. He would hear Mr. Jay now; it was early yet, scarcely 2 o'clock,

Mr. Jay then sent for the books referred to by Mr. Busteed, and proceeded to examine and answer the arguments offered. Among the authorities advanced to support the claim of the plaintiff, it was shown that Alabama Courts had ruled that a man of colour, or a negro was, from that colour, presumed to be a slave, in which case the burden of proof was upon the negro; therefore, this man must be presumed to be a slave, and must prove the contrary if he would be free. But under the Act of Congress by authority of which the plaintiff proceeds, the negro is debarred from bringing the question of his liberty to a regular trial; that is, he is to be sent back to his alleged owner upon the ex parte evidence of a claim produced by said owner or his agents. As opposed to the practice in Alabama, it is established that every man, white or black, going at large in this State of New York, is presumed to be free.

Mr. Jay adverted briefly to the two points raised by Mr. Busteed, but the discussion was not important.

At 2 1-2 o'clock the Commissioner adjourned the hearing until 10 o'clock this morning, when (probably) a decision will be given.

THIRD DAY....Saturday, April 3.

PRESTON SENT BACK TO SLAVERY—EXTRAORDINARY DISPATCH—REFUSAL OF JUDGE JUDSON TO INTERFERE—A HUSBAND TORN FROM HIS WIFE FOREVER.

U. S. COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE—Before Mr. Morton, Commissioner.—In the case of Horace Preston, claimed by W. Reese, of Maryland, as a fugitive from Slavery, the proceedings were adjourned on Saturday forenoon, for the decision, to the large Court-room, there being but fifteen minutes to spare to the time when the District Court was to open in the Cuban case.

Mr. Morton, the Commissioner, came in, read a paper, declaring that every thing had been done conformably to law, and concluding that the said Horace Preston owes service and labour to W. Reese, of Maryland, and entitled to a certificate, and that such will be granted.

The Officers took hold of Preston to carry him off, the cry of his wife was heard, and Mr. Morton gathered up his papers to leave the stand.

Mr. Jay asked the Commissioner if it was not understood, after the decision of the motion to dismiss the complaint, that the testimony of the witnesses who had been subpœnaed should be admitted.

Mr. Morton—No, Sir—I am done. Mr. M. said he had understood the case closed; he then proceeded toward the side door,

Mr.

Miscellany.

King Alphonso.

A FABLE.....*From the French of Florian.*

BY CLARENCE COOK.

A certain King who lived on Tagus' banks,
And whom men called the Sage,
Not that in worldly matters he was wise,
But since, from night till morn, his royal eyes
Were fixed in study on the learned page;
Alphonso was a famed Astronomer.
And better than his kingdom's far
He knew the affairs of every star,
And quitted of his council room
For the dearer sun or moon.
Going, one evening, to his tower,
His courtiers round him, thus he said:
"My friends, this night I hope to see
Men in the moon, if such there be,
For I have instruments of power
With which that secret must be read."
His courtiers smiled—"Your Grace," says these
"May see such common things with ease,
Much better ought your Grace to see—"
While thus the noble triflers talked,
Up to the King a beggar walked,
With tattered cap in trembling hand,
Some maravedis to demand.
But King Alphonso, wrapped in thought,
Heard and saw the beggar not.
The poor man urged his constant prayer,
His words fell fruitless on the air;
Courtier and King kept on their way,
Nor saw him kneel nor heard him pray:
Alphonso, staring at the sky,
Said to his favourites, "Soon shall I
Men in the moon with ease descry."
At last the beggar seized his gown
And cried, "God placed you on your throne
To rule the earth whereon you live,
And not the heavens above your head;
Look round you, *here* are men; relieve
Their anguish, for they cry for bread."

EARLY MANUSCRIPT EMENDATIONS OF SHAKSPEARE'S TEXT.

A SHORT time before the death of the late Mr. Rodd, of Newport street, I happened to be in his shop when a considerable parcel of books arrived from the country. He told me that they had been bought for him at an auction—I think in Bedfordshire; but I did not look on it as a matter of any importance to observe from whence they came. He unpacked them in my presence; and I cast my eyes on several that did not appear to me very inviting, as they were entirely out of my line of reading. There were two, however, that attracted my attention; one being a fine copy of Forio's Italian Dictionary, of the edition of 1611, and the other a much thumbed, abused and imperfect copy of the second folio of Shakspeare in 1632. The first I did not possess; and the last I was willing to buy, inasmuch as I apprehended it would add some missing leaves to a copy of the same impression which I had had for some time on my shelves. As was his usual course, Mr. Rodd required a very reasonable price for both; for the first, I remember, I gave 12s., and for the last, only £1 10s.

Your readers are no doubt aware that the second folio of Shakspeare, in 1632, is never, even when in good condition, a very dear book; but this copy was without the title-page (consequently without the portrait), wanted several sheets at the end, and was imperfect in the middle of the volume. With this last circumstance I was not acquainted at the time, for I saw only the commencement and the conclusion; but I observed that some of the leaves were blotted and dirty, and that although the rough calf-binding was evidently the original, it was greasy and shabby. On the outside of one of the covers was inscribed, "Tho. Perkins, his books."

When the volume reached my house, I employed a person to ascertain whether any of the leaves in it would supply the deficiency in my other copy. Finding that I was disappointed in this respect (excepting as far as regarded two torn and stained pages), I put the book away in a closet, somewhat vexed that I had mis-spent my money. I did not look at it again until shortly before I removed to my present residence, when I selected such books as I chose to take with me from those which I meant to leave behind in the Pantechnicon. Then it was that I for the first time remarked that the folio of 1632 which I had bought from Mr. Rodd, contained manuscript alterations of the text as it stood printed in that early edition. These alterations were in an old hand-writing—probably not of a later date than the Protectorate—and applied (as I afterwards found, on going through the volume) to every play. There was hardly a page without emendations of more or less importance and interest, and some of them appeared to me highly valuable. The punctuation, on which, of course, so much of the author's meaning depends, was corrected in, I may say, thousands of places.

I did not come into possession of this volume—much less examine it minutely—until some years after I had completed the Shakspeare which I superintended through the press; otherwise I should unquestionably have made great use of it in the notes; and in particular instances the changes appear to me not merely so plausible, but so self-evident, that, in spite of the principle I adopted, of a close adherence to the old printed copies, I cannot help thinking that I should have availed myself of a few of these manuscript alterations in the text. Some of them may have been purely arbitrary or conjectural; but others seem to have been justified either by occasional resort to better manuscripts than those employed by the old player-editors, or, as is not improbable, by the recital of the text at one of our old theatres when the corrector of my folio of 1632 was present, and of which recital he afterwards availed himself.

Having said thus much—which, in fact, is all I can say—of the history of the volume, I shall now proceed to select a few specimens of the improvements which it contains of the old and ordinary readings of Shakspeare.

I begin with the play that stands first in the volume, "The Tempest." In act i, sc. 2, the following passage occurs in a speech by Prospero:

> He being thus lorded,
> Not only with what my revenue yielded,
> But what my power might else exact—like one,
> Who having, unto truth, by telling of it,
> Made such a sinner of his memory
> To credit his own lie—he did believe
> He was indeed the duke.

Now, the commentators agree that this passage must be corrupt; and they would amend it in various ways, which it is not necessary here to specify. It is very clear that Antonio could not make "a sinner of his memory" by telling "truth"—but by telling *untruth*; and the fact is, that the old compositor placed the preposition *un* (or *in*, as it stands in the folios) before the wrong word, as will be evident the moment the corrected text of my folio of 1632 is quoted—where, also, *loaded* is substituted for "lorded":

> He being thus *loaded*,
> Not only with what my revenue yielded,
> But what my power might else exact—like one,
> Who having, *to untruth*, by telling of it,
> Made such a sinner of his memory,
> To credit his own lie—he did believe
> He was indeed the duke.

Whether we do or do not consent to adopt *loaded* for "lorded," in the first line, there can surely be no hesitation in substituting *to untruth* for "unto truth," because the substitution at once removes all difficulty, and, while it clears the poet's grammar, makes his meaning indisputable.

I will now proceed to an emendation of a different kind, in the next play, "The Two Gentlemen of Verona." In act iv, sc. 3, we read as follows, in one of the speeches of Sir Eglamour:

> Madam, I pity much your grievances,
> Which since I know they virtuously are placed,
> I give consent to go along with you.

Nobody, that I am aware of, has remarked on the defectiveness of this passage. That it is defective, is clear; because it is not Silvia's "grievances" that are "virtuously placed," but her love for Valentine. The fact is, that a line must have been omitted; and in my corrected folio of 1632, this line is supplied in the margin, and the whole is made to run thus:

> Madam, I pity much your grievances,
> *And the most true affections that you beare,*
> Which since I know they virtuously are placed,
> I give consent to go along with you.

Here we see the sense completed by the supply of an apparent omission; and we need feel little doubt that it was obtained from some more accurate manuscript than that used for the folio of 1623—from which, as is well known, the folio of 1632 was reprinted.

My next instance is from the next play, "The Merry Wives of Windsor," act i, sc. 3, where Falstaff is congratulating himself on the favourable impression he flatters himself he has made on Mrs. Ford. He says:

> Briefly, I do mean to make love to Ford's wife: I spy entertainment in her; she discourses, she carves, she give the leer of invitation.

Here the difficulty arises out of the word "carves;" and the commentators, to justify the use of it, dwell on the formerly important accomplishment of carving—forgetting that it was not then an important accomplishment for women, and not observing the utter want of connection between the words "she discourses, she *carves*, she gives the leer of invitation." My corrected folio of 1632 shows how the accidental transposition of a single letter has obscured the poet's sense; the passage there stands as follows:

> Briefly, I do mean to make love to Ford's wife: I spy entertainment in her; she discourses, she *craves*, she gives the leer of invitation.

According to Falstaff's own account, Mrs. Ford had a *craving* appetite for him. She discoursed with her eyes, and therefore gave "the leer of invitation"—and hence the "judicious oeillads" with which she had "examined his parts."

An embarrassment of a more important kind meets us in the very outset of "Measure for Measure"—where the Duke, addressing Escalus, observes, in the ordinary reading:

> Of government the properties to unfold
> Would seem in me t' affect speech and discourse;
> Since I am put to know, that your own science
> Exceeds, in that, the lists of all advice
> My strength can give you: then, no more remains,
> But that to your sufficiency as your worth is able,
> And let them WORK.

The meaning is pretty evident; but the expression of that meaning is obscure and corrupt—as indeed the measure alone would establish. Various conjectural modes of setting the passage right have been proposed; and perhaps what follows from my corrected folio of 1632 has no better foundation; but, at all event, it restores both the sense and the metre, and may, for aught we know, give the very words of Shakspeare:

> Of government the properties to unfold
> Would seem in me t' affect speech and discourse;
> Since I am *apt* to know, that your own science
> Exceeds (in that) the lists of all advice
> My strength can give you; then, no more remains,
> But *add* to your sufficiency your worth,
> And let them work.

How "that" in the old editions came to be printed for *add*, and how "is able" came to be foisted, most unnecessarily and awkwardly, at the end of the same line, it is not easy to explain. The third line is also much cleared by the substitution of *apt* for "put"—which was an easy misprint: "Apt to know" is an expression of every-day occurrence.

This drama, as it has come down to us, is perhaps the most corrupt of any in the whole volume; and the manuscript amendments introduced in my copy of 1632 are numerous. I may here give another instance from the same play of how much trouble has been caused by the misprint of a single letter. It occurs in act ii, sc. 3, where Isabella tells Angelo how she will bribe him—

> Not with fond shekels of the tested gold,
> Or stones whose rates are either rich or poor
> As fancy values them, but with true prayers, etc.

In the two earliest folios the word in the first line is printed *sickles;* and "shekels" has been of late years universally substituted as a conjectural emendation. The word of the poet was, however, I have no doubt, *circles*—in reference to the shape which "tested gold" bore as money—and my folio of 1632 reads—

> Not with fond *circles* of the tested gold:

but as the manuscript corrector in the place—and in most others—made only just as much alteration as was absolutely necessary, he inserted the letter *r* for the letter *c*, *sirkles;* thus putting an end to all difficulty arising out of the question whether Isabella intended to allude to the Hebrew coin, which, being only of the value of 2s. 6d., could hardly have been of "tested gold." All she meant was to speak contemptuously of money as "fond" (*i. e.*, foolish or worthless) "circles of the tested gold."

Without further pursuing the order of the plays as they stand printed in the folio editions, I will take two or three more illustrations of the value of the manuscript amendments in my copy of 1632. I will select them from dramas which, from the time when they were written to the present day, appear to have been most frequently acted.

In "Macbeth," act iv, sc. 1, Lennox informs the hero that "Macduff has *fled* to England." "*Fled* to England!" exclaims Macbeth, in astonishment; and then follows the speech in which he declares his resolution never to give others such a chance of escape, and adds, according to all modern and ancient editions—

> —— No boasting like a fool;
> This deed I'll do before this purpose cool:
> But no more sighs!

Steevens tells us that the words "But no more sights" are to be considered as a moral to the foregoing scene, in which the witches have exhibited certain visions to Macbeth. But Macbeth was, in truth, in no condition of mind to moralize. He was bent only on surprising Macduff's castle, and on not giving his wife, babes, etc., an opportunity of *flying* from his vengeance. Instead of "But no more *sights*," my corrected folio of 1632 therefore reads, "But no more *flights!*"—

> This deed I'll do before this purpose cool:
> But no more *flights!*

That is, I will take care that no soul shall escape like Macduff. The old compositor (or the copyist of the MS. used by him) mistook the letter *f* for the long *s*—and, disregarding the next letter, printed "sights" for *flights*.

The next scene but one (act iv, sc. 3) has a change which seems to me equally happy. It is where Macduff is sounding Malcolm, who has declared himself unfit to govern on account of the many and deep-rooted vices in his nature, especially his "boundless intemperance." From 1632 to 1852, Macduff has said to Malcolm:

> But fear not yet
> To take upon you what is yours: you may
> Convey your pleasures in a spacious plenty,
> And yet seem cold.

Now, I think it must strike every ear that "convey" is at least an awkward word in such a place. But what is the MS. reading of the line in my folio of 1632?

> *Enjoy* your pleasures with a spacious plenty.

The reader must at once admit the improvement, whether it were made speculatively, or on the authority of some better manuscript, or on the recital of an actor, who knew the words of the poet. The old printer read "convey" for *enjoy*.

In "Hamlet," act. i, sc. 5, occurs another easy misprint, the correction of which might have saved a great deal of useless discussion among the commentators. The Ghost, as the lines have always been printed, says to Hamlet:

> I am thy father's spirit,
> Doomed for a certain term to walk the night,
> And, for the day, confined to fast in fires,
> Till the foul crimes, done in my days of nature,
> Are burnt and purged away.

Dispute has arisen out of the words "confined to fast in fires;" and various passages from Chaucer, Nash, etc., have been quoted to show—what there could be no doubt about—that one of the punishments in hell was "to see meat, but got none." But let us look at what seems to be the fact, as gathered from my corrected folio of 1632—that the copyist of the manuscript used by the printer, writing by his ear (as Malone over and over again admits he did), inserted "fast in" for *lasting*—the true and natural reading being—

> And, for the day, confined to *lasting* fires.

It seems to me that we ought to feel little hesitation in future in substituting *lasting* for "fast in."

In the scene between Hamlet and his mother, two, as I think, obvious errors of the press are pointed out in manuscript in my folio of 1632. One of these occurs in the speech in which Hamlet is contrasting the "picture" of his father and of his uncle:

> For, at your age,
> The hey-day in the blood is tame, it's humble,
> And waits upon the judgment; and what judgment
> Would step from this to this?

Read *stoop* for "step," and how much additional force, as supporting the contrast, is given to the lines:

> and what judgment
> Would *stoop* from this to this?

Just afterwards, the Ghost (*unarmed*, as the manuscript stage-direction in my folio states) enters, and Hamlet thus addresses it:

> Do you not come your tardy son to chide,
> That, lapsed in time and passion, lets go by,
> The important acting of your dread command?

For "time" of the folio of 1632 (and of the other folios) the manuscript corrector of my copy has, more than plausibly, written *fume* in the margin—a word much more likely to have been used by Shakspeare, and not difficult to have been mistaken by the old printer:

> That, lapsed in *fume* and passion, lets go by
> The important acting of your dread command.

I come now to the last quotation I intend to offer at present to show the value, as it strikes me, of the changes recommended in manuscript in my folio of 1632. It is a passage on which no remark that I recollect has been made by any of the editors, from the time of Rowe downwards; but, in my opinion, it is certainly corrupt, and requires the correction proposed. It is in the first scene of the first act of "Othello"—where Iago is telling Roderigo how Cassio had been preferred to him in the lieutenancy, and is abusing the manner in which the claims of military service and knowledge were often at that time disregarded. The lines, as uniformly printed, are these:

> —— Others there are,
> Who, trimm'd in forms and visages of duty,
> Keep yet their hearts attending on themselves.

The expression "trimmed in forms and visages of duty" is at least unusual, if not forced and unnatural; for, supposing that the persons spoken of might be "trimmed in the forms," it is not easy to understand how they could be *trimmed* in the *visages* of duty. The truth seems to be, that neither word came from Shakspeare's pen; in my corrected folio of 1632 the lines are altered as follows—and it appears to me that the now reading at once recommends itself to adoption:

> —— Others there are,
> Who, *learn'd* in form and *usages* of duty,
> Keep yet their hearts attending on themselves.

Here the printer misread the manuscript and altered *learn'd* into "trimm'd," and *usages* into "visages." The last is an error accounted for in an instant, when we recollect that in 1623 it was the constant practice to write and print words beginning with the letter *u* as if they began with the letter *v*: thus *usages* would be spelt *vsages*, and easily mistaken by a mechanical compositor who did not attend to the sense of what he was composing. Even if we doubted about the fitness of substituting *learn'd* for "trimm'd," we could scarcely hesitate in placing in the text *usages* for "visages."

I imagine that I have said enough to establish the singularity, if not the value, of the copy of the folio of 1632 in my possession. The instances which I have selected are only a few out of hundreds, and by no means the most striking. Another curiosity about the volume is, that all the stage-directions are minutely supplied, and the *asides* carefully noted, not unfrequently in places where neither the one nor the other is required, the matter speaking for itself. Sometimes these indications are curious; as in the instance of the *Ghost*, in "Hamlet," act iv, scene 3, where we are told that he comes in "unarmed"—consistently with the 4to. 1603, where the stage direction is given thus simply: "Enter the ghost in his night-gown;" showing that he was not attired in armour, as when, earlier in the drama, he appeared on the platform.

It is my intention to place this relic before, and at the disposal of, the Council of the Shakspeare Society at its next meeting. The members will then be better able to judge of the date and of the peculiarity and importance of the alterations suggested on nearly every page; and if they agree with me, they will, in due time, and as their funds allow, print such a selection of the manuscript notes as may best serve to explain, illustrate or amend the acknowledged defects of the text of the plays of our greatest dramatic poet.

Respectfully, J. PAYNE COLLIER.

—*The (London) Athenæum.*

*ARVINE'S CYCLOPÆDIA OF ANECDOTES.**

OF the many miscellaneous compilations of the day, contributions of the joint-stock of biographies, memoirs, and above all, those omnivorous repositories the newspapers, we know of none pleasanter for a parlour table companion than the lately completed Cyclopædia of Anecdotes. It is a quaint omnium gatherum, grouped and arranged, not too scientifically, of all sorts of oddities and jests, new and old—generally content with a paragraph, sometimes stretching into an essay. The chance medley of such a book is its attraction; every page is not equally good, and you dip into it with the excitement of a lottery, finding a good thing in the mass to suit your own taste.

For a lucky dip into its seven hundred pages and three thousand "leetle anecdotes," take the following:

ORIGIN OF THE WORD "SCHOONER."

"Mr. Andrew Robinson, of Gloucester, September 8, 1790, constructed a vessel, which he masted and rigged in the same manner as schooners are at this day. On her going off the stocks and passing into the water, a by-stander cried out, 'O, how she schoons!'

"Robinson instantly replied, 'A schooner let her be.'

"From this time vessels thus masted and rigged have gone by the name of *schooners*.

"'This account was confirmed to me,' says Cotton Tufts, by a great number of persons in Gloucester. I made particular inquiry of an aged sea captain, who informed me, that he had not, in any of his voyages to Europe or in America, seen any of these vessels prior to Robinson's construction.'"

That derivation looks much more anecdotical than etymological. Mr. Bartlett gives the story in his Dictionary of Americanisms an earlier date, 1714, and is inclined to trust to it from its circumstantiality. The usual reference is to the German schooner, but that is said to be from the English again.

BOZ.

"A fellow-passenger with Mr. Dickens, in the Britannia steamship, across the Atlantic, inquired of the author the origin of his signature, 'Boz.' Mr. Dickens replied that he had a little brother who resembled so much the Moses in the Vicar of Wakefield, that he used to call him Moses, also; but a younger girl, who could not then articulate plain, was in the habit of calling him *Bozie, Boz*. This simple circumstance made him assume that name in the first article he risked to the public, and, therefore, he continued the name, as the first effort was approved of."

HOOK'S CHOICE.

"A wise man, as well as witty, was Theodore Hook, when he told the alderman who had already surfeited him, and yet pressed him to take of still another course, 'I thank you; but if it's the same to you, I'll take the rest in money.'"

SNUFFING THE CANDLE.

"Burke, one evening, in snuffing the candle, was awkward enough to snuff it out. 'Ah!' said he, 'I fall under the censure of Horace:

> '*Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio.*'"

SEEING THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

"A stranger once called on the eccentric Professor Hermann, when the following questions and answers passed between them:

"'What is your name?'

"'War.'

"'How old are you?'

"'Thirty years.'

"'Then I have the unexpected pleasure of seeing the thirty years war.'"

RANDOLPH IN THE SENATE.

"Randolph was terrible in his readiness in retort. As Whipple has observed in his Lectures, 'No hyperbole of contempt or scorn could be launched against him, but he could overtop it with something more scornful and contemptuous. Opposition only maddened him into more brilliant bitterness.'

"'Isn't it a shame, Mr. President,' said he, one day, in the Senate, 'that the noble bulldogs of the administration should be wasting their precious time in worrying the rats of the opposition?' Immediately the Senate was in an uproar, and he was clamorously called to order. The presiding officer, however, sustained him; and, pointing his long skinny finger at his opponents, Randolph screamed out, 'Rats, did I say?—*Mice, mice!*'"

But above all, our eternal gratitude to Mr. Arvine for fishing up from the great deep—where so many forgotten felicities lie buried—this genuine morsel of rare Tom Hood:

THOMAS HOOD ON BOOKS AND READING.

"The secretaries of the Manchester Athenæum bazaar committee addressed to Thomas Hood a request that he would allow his name to be placed on the list of patrons of the approaching bazaar. To this request the secretaries received the following characteristic reply:

"'ST. JOHN'S WOOD, 18 *July*, 1843.
(From my bed), 17 Elm-tree Road.

"'Gentlemen: If my humble name can be of the least use for your purpose, it is heartily at your service, with my best wishes for the prosperity of the Manchester Athenæum, and my warmest approval of the objects of that institution.

"'I have elsewhere recorded my own deep obligations to literature, that a natural turn for reading and intellectual pursuits probably preserved me from the moral shipwreck, so apt to befall those who are deprived in early life of the paternal pilotage. At the very least, my books kept me aloof from the ring, the dog-pit, the tavern, and the saloon, with their degrading orgies. For the closet associate of Pope and Addison—the mind accustomed to the noble, though silent, discourse of Shakspeare and Milton—will hardly seek or put up with low company and slang. The reading animal will not be content with the brutish wallowings that satisfy the unlearned pigs of the world.

"'Later experience enables me to depose to the comfort and blessing that literature can prove in seasons of sickness and sorrow—how powerfully intellectual pursuits can help in keeping the head from craving, and the heart from breaking, nay, not to be too grave, how generous mental food can even atone for a meagre diet—rich fare on the paper for short commons on the cloth.

"'Poisoned by the malaria of the Dutch marshes, my stomach, for many months, resolutely set itself against fish, flesh, or fowl: my appetite had no more edge than the German knife placed before me. But luckily, the mental palate and digestion were still sensible and vigorous; and whilst I passed untasted every dish at the Rhenish *table d'hote*, I could yet enjoy my Peregrine Pickle, and the feast after the manner of the ancients. There was no yearning towards calf's head *a la tortue*, or sheep's heart; but I could still relish Head *a la Brunnen*, and the Heart of Mid-Lothian.

"'Still more recently, it was my misfortune, with a tolerable appetite, to be condemned to lenten fare, like Sancho Panza, by my physician—to a diet, in fact, lower than any prescribed by the poor-law commissioners; all animal food, from a bullock to a rabbit, being strictly interdicted; as well as all fluids stronger than that which lays dust, washes pinafores, and waters polyanthus. But "the feast of reason and the flow of soul" were still mine. Denied beef, I had *Bulwer* and *Cowper*, forbidden mutton, there was *Lamb*, and in lieu of pork, the great *Bacon* or *Hogg*.

"'Then, as to beverage, it was hard, doubtless, for a Christian to set his face like a Turk against the juice of the grape. But, eschewing wine, I had still my *Butler*; and in the absence of liquor, all the *choice spirits* from Tom Browne to Tom Moore.

"'That, though confined, physically, to the drink that drowns kittens, I quaffed mentally, not merely the best of our own home-made, but the rich, racy, sparkling growths of France and Italy, of Germany and Spain—the champagne of Moliere, and the Monte Pulciano of Boccacio, the hock of Schiller, and the sherry of Cervantes. Depressed bodily by the fluid that damps everything, I got intellectually elevated with Milton, a little merry with Swift, or rather jolly with Rabelais, whose Pantagruel, by the way, is quite equal to the best gruel with rum in it.

"'So far can literature palliate or compensate for gastronomical privations. But there are other evils, great and small, in this world, which try the stomach less than the head, the heart and the temper—bowls that will not roll right—well-laid schemes that will "gang aglee"—and ill winds that blow with the pertinacity of the monsoon. Of these, Providence has allotted me a full share; but still, paradoxical as it may sound, my *burden* has been greatly lightened by a *load of books*. The manner of this will be best understood from a feline illustration. Everybody has heard of the two Kilkenny cats, who devoured each other; but it is not so generally known that they left behind them an orphan kitten, which, true to the breed, began to eat itself up, till it was diverted from the operation by a mouse. Now, the human mind, under vexation, is like that kitten, for it is apt to *prey upon itself*, unless drawn off by a new object; and none better for the purpose than a book; for example, one of Defoe's; for who, in reading his thrilling History of the Great Plague, would not be reconciled to a few little ones?

"'Many, many a dreary, weary hour have I got over—many a gloomy misgiving postponed—many a mental or bodily annoyance forgotten, by help of the tragedies and comedies of our dramatists and novelists! Many a trouble has been soothed by the still small voice of the moral philosopher—many a dragon-like care charmed to sleep by the sweet song of the poet; for all which I cry incessantly, not aloud, but in my heart, Thanks and honour to the glorious masters of the pen, and the great invention of the press!

"'Such has been my own experience of the blessing and comfort of literature and intellectual pursuits; and of the same mind, doubtless, was Sir Humphry Davy, who went for "consolations in *Travel*," not to the inn or the posting house, but to his library and his books. I am gentlemen, yours, very truly, "THOS. HOOD.'"

THE HOME OF COBBETT.

THE name of Blamire has always a certain interest for me, in consequence of a circumstance which, as it took place somewhere about five-and-forty years ago, and has reference to a flirtation of twenty years previous, there cannot now be much harm in relating.

Being with my father and mother on a visit about six miles from Southampton, we were invited by a gentleman of the neighbourhood to meet the wife and daughters of a certain Dr. Blamire. "An old friend of yours and mine," quoth our inviter to my father. "Don't you remember how you used to flirt with the fair lady when you and Babington were at Haslar? Faith, if Blamire had not taken pity on her, it would have gone hard with the poor damsel! However, he made up to the disconsolate maiden, and she got over it. Nothing like a new love for chasing away an old one. You must dine with us to-morrow. I shall like to see the meeting."

My father did not attempt to deny the matter. Men never do. He laughed, as all that wicked sex do laugh at such sins twenty years after, and professed that he should be very glad to shake hands with his old acquaintance. So the next day we met.

I was a little curious to see how my own dear mother, my mamma that was, and the stranger lady, my mamma that might have been, would bear themselves on the occasion. At first, my dear mother, an exceedingly lady-like, quiet person, had considerably the advantage, being prepared for the *recontre*, and perfectly calm and composed; while Mrs. Blamire, taken, I suspect, by surprise, was a good deal startled and flustered. This state of things, however, did not last. Mrs. Blamire having got over the first shock, comported herself like what she evidently was, a practiced woman of the world—would talk to no one but ourselves—and seemed resolved not only to make friends with her successful rival, but to strike up an intimacy. This by no means entered into my mother's calculations. As the one advanced the other receded, and, keeping always within the limits of civility, I never heard so much easy chat put aside with so many cool and stately monosyllables in my life.

The most diverting part of this scene, very amusing to a stander-by, was, that my father the only real culprit, was the only person who throughout maintained the appearance and demeanor of the most unconscious innocence. He complimented Mrs. Blamire on her daughters, (two very fine girls)—inquired after his old friend, the doctor, who was attending his patients in a distant town—and laughed and talked over by-gone stories with the one lady, just as if he had not jilted her—and played the kind and attentive husband to the other, just as if he had never made love to anybody except his own dear wife.

It was one of the strange domestic comedies which are happening around us every day, if we were but aware of them, and might probably have ended in a renewal of acquaintance between the two families, but for a dispute that occurred toward the end of the evening between Mrs. Blamire and the friend in whose house we were staying, which made the lady resolve against accepting his hospitable invitations, and I half suspect hurried her off a day or two before her time.

This host of ours was a very celebrated person—no other than William Cobbett. Sporting, not politics, had brought about our present visit and subsequent intimacy. We had become acquainted with Mr. Cobbett two or three years before, at this very house, where we were now dining to meet Mrs. Blamire. Then my father, a great sportsman, had met him while on a coursing expedition near Alton—had given him a greyhound that he had fallen in love with—had invited him to attend another coursing meeting near our own house in Berkshire—and finally, we were now, in the early Autumn, with all manner of pointers, and setters, and greyhounds, and spaniels, shooting ponies, and gun-cases, paying the return visit to him.

He had at that time a large house at Botley, with a lawn and gardens sweeping down to the Burseldon River, which divided his, Mr. Cobbett's, territories from the beautiful grounds of the old friend where we had been originally staying, the great squire of the place. His own house—large, high, massive, red, and square, and perched on a considerable eminence—always struck me as not being unlike its proprietor. It was filled at that time almost to overflowing. Lord Cochrane was there, then in the very height of his warlike fame, and as unlike the common notion of a warrior as could be. A gentle, quiet, mild young man, was this burner of French fleets, and cutter-out of Spanish vessels, as one should see in a Summer day. He lay about under the trees, reading Seldon on the Dominion of the Seas, and letting the children (and children always know with whom they may take liberties), play all sorts of tricks with him at their pleasure. His ship's surgeon was also a visitor, and a young mid-shipman, and sometimes an elderly lieutenant and a Newfoundland dog; fine, sailor-like creatures, all. Then there was a very learned clergyman, a great friend of Mr. Gifford, of the "Quarterly," with his wife and daughter—exceedingly clever persons. Two literary gentlemen from London, and ourselves, completed the actual party; but there was a large fluctuating series of guests for the hour, or guests for the day, of almost all ranks and descriptions, from the earl and his countess to the farmer and his dame. The house had room for all, and the hearts of the owners would have had room for three times the number.

I never saw hospitality more genuine, more simple, or more thoroughly successful in the great end of hospitality, the putting everybody completely at ease. There was not the slightest attempt at finery, or display, or gentility. They called it a farm-house, and everything was in accordance with the largest idea of a great English yeoman of the old time. Everything was excellent—everything abundant—all served with the greatest nicety by trim waiting damsels; and everything went on with such quiet regularity, that of the large circle of guests not one could find himself in the way. I need not say a word more in praise of the good wife, very lately dead, to whom this admirable order was mainly due. She was a sweet, motherly woman, realising our notion of one of Scott's most charming characters, *Alice Dinmont*, in her simplicity, her kindness, and her devotion to her husband and her children.

At this time William Cobbett was at the height of his political reputation; but of politics we heard little, and should, I think, have heard nothing, but for an occasional red-hot patriot, who would introduce the subject, which our host would fain put aside, and get rid of as speedily as possible. There was something of *Dandie Dinmont* about him, with his unfailing good-humour and good spirits—his heartiness—his love of field sports, and his liking for a foray. He was a tall, stout man, fair, and sunburnt with a bright smile, and an air compounded of the soldier and the farmer, to which his habit of wearing an eternal red waistcoat contributed not a little He was, I think, the most athletic and vigorous person that I have ever known. Nothing could tire him. At home in the morning he would begin his active day by mowing his own lawn, beating his gardener, Robinson, the best mower, except himself, in the parish, at that fatiguing work.

For early rising, indeed, he had an absolute passion, and some of the poetry that we trace in his writings, whenever he speaks of scenery or of rural objects, broke out in his method of training his children into his own matutinal habits. The boy who was first down stairs was called the lark for the day, and had, among other indulgences, the pretty privilege of making his mother's nosegay, and that of any lady visitors. Nor was this the only trace of poetical feeling that he displayed. Whenever he described a place, were it only to say where such a covey lay, or such a hare was found sitting, you could see it, so graphic—so vivid—so true was the picture. He showed the same taste in the purchase of his beautiful farm at Botley, Fairthorn; even in the pretty name. To be sure, he did not give the name, but I always thought that it unconsciously influenced his choice in the purchase. The beauty of the situation certainly did. The fields lay along the Burseldon River, and might have been shown to a foreigner as a specimen of the richest and loveliest English scenery. In the cultivation of his garden, too, he displayed the same taste. Few persons excelled him in the management of vegetables, fruit and flowers. His green Indian corn—his Carolina beans—his watermelons, could hardly have been exceeded at New York. His wall-fruit was equally splendid, and much as flowers have been studied since that day, I never saw a more glowing or a more fragrant Autumn garden than that at Botley, with its pyramids of hollyhocks, and its masses of chinasters, of cloves, of mignonnette, and of variegated geranium. The chances of life soon parted us, as, without grave faults on either side, people do lose sight of one another; but I shall always look back with pleasure and regret to that visit.

While we were there, a grand display of English games, especially of single-stick and wrestling, took place under Mr. Cobbett's auspices Players came from all parts of the country—the South, the West, and the North—to contend for fame and glory, and also, I believe, for a well-filled purse; and this exhibition which—quite forgetting the precedent set by a certain princess, *de jure*, called Rosalind, and another princess, *de facto*, called Celia—she termed barbarous, was the cause of his quarrel with my mamma that might have been, Mrs. Blamire.

In my life I never saw two people in a greater passion. Each was thoroughly persuaded of being in the right, either would have gone to the stake upon it, and of course the longer they argued the more determined became their conviction. They said all manner of uncivil things; they called each other very unpretty names; she got very near to saying, "Sir, you're a savage;" and he did say, "Ma'am, you're a fine lady;" they talked, both at once, until they could talk no longer, and I have always considered it as one of the greatest pieces of Christian forgiveness that I ever met with, when Mr. Cobbett, after they had both rather cooled down a little, invited Mrs. Blamire to dine at his house the next day. She, less charitable, declined the invitation, and we parted.

As I have said, my father and he had too much of the hearty English character in common not to be great friends; I myself was somewhat of a favourite (I think because of my love for poetry, though he always said not), and I shall never forget the earnestness with which he congratulated us both on our escape from such a wife and such a mother. "She'd have been the death of you!" quoth he, and he believed it. Doubtless, she, when we were gone, spoke quite as ill of him, and believed it also. Nevertheless, excellent persons were they both; only they had quarrelled about the propriety or the impropriety of a bout at singlestick! Such a thing is anger!—*Miss Mitford's "Recollections."*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

A VALUABLE ESTATE.—Mr. Morrison, of the firm of Morrison, Dillon and Co., warehousemen, of Fore street, City, is in treaty for the splendid estate of Appuldurcombe, in the Isle of Wight, the property of the Earl of Yarborough. Its value is estimated at £150,000. —*Lond. paper.*

——A SHORT DOZEN.—George III., speaking to Archbishop Sutton of his large family, used the expression, "I believe your grace has better than a dozen." "No, sir (replied the archbishop), only eleven."—"Well (replied the king), is that not *better* than a dozen?"—*Poynder's Literary Extracts.*

——At a meeting a few days ago of the Philological Society, T. Watts, Esq., read a paper on Cardinal Mezzofanti, whom he described as being the greatest linguist that ever existed. He certainly was one of the most wonderful curiosities of the Eternal City. During the later years of his life, a sight of the highest interest was annually to be witnessed in Rome. At the examination of the pupils of the College of the Propaganda, it is customary for each of the young missionaries of various countries to deliver an oration in his own language. At these meetings, Mezzofanti used to attend and converse with almost all of the scholars—"passing with equal fluency from the dialects of the extreme West to those of the extreme East—from Irish, which he spoke with ease, to Chinese, of which he was peculiarly fond." Byron said of him, "he is a walking Polyglott, and ought to have existed at the time of the Tower of Babel as universal interpreter. I tried him in all the tongues of which I new a single oath, and egad! he astounded me—even to my English." There is one omission, however—it does not seem that even this miraculous Polyglottist could speak *Welsh.*

—— CHRISTIANITY *v.* CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—Whilst on the one hand, Christianity taught men to behold in human life an inviolable sacredness, and hence the murderer must appear but the more worthy of punishment; so, on the other hand, it taught them also to recognise in the transgressor the image of God obscured—the fallen man, who could still be an object of God's redeeming love, to whom, therefore, a space should be granted for repentance and reformation: for this reason Alcuin declared himself opposed to the punishment of death. It is often mentioned with praise, as the work of pious monks and clergy, that they interceded with the judges to obtain a milder punishment for the guilty, especially that they sought to procure pardon for criminals condemned to death, and, in case they failed, still attempted to reanimate their bodies when taken down from the gallows. If such pious men sometimes failed of discerning the true limits of gentleness, and if, where the administration of justice yielded to their influence, civil order was liable to suffer injury; yet of far greater importance was the antagonism thus created against the rude popular feeling; and the influence which thus went to soften the dispositions of men, and made them look upon human life as a sacred thing; while in some cases, perhaps, a convent might be converted into a house of reformation for such pardoned criminals.—*Neander's Church History, Vol. V.: Bohn's Standard Library.*

——O'CONNELL'S LAST APPEARANCE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—He sate in an unusual place in that generally occupied by the leader of the opposition, and spoke from the red box, convenient to him from the number of documents to which he had to refer. His appearance was of great debility and the tones of his voice were very still. His words, indeed, only reached those who were immediately around him, and the ministers sitting on the other side of the green table, and listening with that interest and respectful attention which became the occasion. It was a strange and touching spectacle to those who remembered the form of colossal energy and the clear and thrilling tones that had once startled, disturbed, and controlled senates. Mr. O'Connell was on his legs for nearly two hours, assisted occasionally in the management of his documents by some devoted aide-de-camp. To the house generally it was a performance of dumb show, a feeble old man muttering before a table; but respect for the great parliamentary personage kept all as orderly as if the fortunes of a party hung upon his rhetoric; and though not an accent reached the gallery, means were taken that next morning the country should not lose the last and not the least interesting of the speeches of one who had so long occupied and agitated the mind of nations. This remarkable address was an abnegation of the whole policy of Mr. O'Connell's career. It proved, by a mass of authentic evidence ranging over a long term of years, that Irish outrage was the consequence of physical misery, and that the social evils of that country could not be successfully encountered by political remedies. To complete the picture, it concluded with a panegyric of Ulster, and a patriotic quotation from Lord Clare.—"*Lord G. Bentick,*" *by B. Disraeli, M. P.*

——A NEW ZEALAND LEGEND.—The following legend was related to me by a gentleman, when discoursing upon the customs of the New Zealanders. It is their account of the origin of their land, and illustrates the absurdities which they believe: "Old Morm (query, rightly spelt?) was a great fisherman, and being at one time in want of fish-hooks, he quietly killed his two sons and took their jaw-bones for hooks. As a requital to them for the loss of their lives, he made the right eye of his eldest son the morning star, and the right eye of his youngest son the evening star. One day he was sitting on a rock fishing with one of the jaw-bones, when he hooked something extraordinarily heavy, whales were nothing to him. However, this resisted all his endeavours, and at length he was obliged to resort to other means to land this monster. He caught a dove, and tying the line